

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 2.—APRIL—1906.

---

## I.

“TIS SAYING MAKES IT SO.”

PROF. C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

When Shakspeare put into the mouth of Hamlet the words, “There’s nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so,” he gave proof of having sounded, in his own thinking, the depths of all philosophy. In them he embodies one of those pregnant truths which set going a train of ideas, boundless in extent, immeasurable in possibility. But, as one advances in life, and allows one’s faculties free play upon men and things, the conviction grows that, after all, the Hamlets are few, the Shaksperes fewer still; that Lord Bacon was perhaps not far wrong when he affirmed: “There is in mankind more of the fool than of the wise”; that Puck was not merely jesting when, with easy assurance, he cried: “What fools these mortals be!” For, if men are to be judged by what they have thought, said, and done, *in the mass*—by the sum total of conduct and achievement—one must conclude that they have, consciously or unconsciously, adopted, as the ultimate, all-inclusive proposition, this modified form of the great thinker’s dictum: “There’s nothing either true or false, but saying makes it so.” How else may we interpret many of the most interesting phenomena of life and thought?

An ancient Hebrew chronicler (who shall tell us his name, and where he lived or when?) saw fit to cast into literary form the story of the beginning of created things then current among the sages of his tribe or people. With a circumstantial accuracy which makes the story read like the account of an eye-witness, he narrates the several stages. That there may be no misapprehension as to the time required for the completion of each process, he says: "And God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." Then follows an account of the remaining five days' work, each process being distinctly marked, and its completion as distinctly indicated. In conclusion we are told: "And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Hence the origin of the Jewish Sabbath, the holy seventh day, the day of rest.

For thousands of years a goodly portion of the human family (and by far the most enlightened portion, we who are of it are proud to maintain) accepted implicitly and literally this ancient account. But, finally, arose the science of geology; and there, in the pages of the great Stone Book, in characters absolutely unalterable by human agency, and inscribed by the hand of God himself, were traced the records of terrestrial creation. Then it became apparent that the days of our Hebrew historian must be lengthened out into ages, the years of which cannot be numbered; that the order in which he had disposed the several stages must be materially changed; that little, if any, coincidence appears in the order of land and water products.

And how was this momentous discovery received? By the open-minded, with reverent, unspeakable joy. For lo! instead of a conjuror or magician—at whose word suns blaze forth their light, order springs from chaos, sea and land and air are peopled, man stands erect in the image of his maker, and woman is opportunely formed from a superfluous masculine rib—the God of the universe is revealed to us in all his glory, majesty, and power; a God who works by processes, gradual in development, infinite in duration; a God who knows not days or hours, times or seasons; whose only limitation, so far as man can discover, is the limitation of his own self-contrived, self-imposed law. To the reverent mind how unspeakably grand and satisfying is all this! How much wiser than the accurate finality of the historian's words seems now the outburst of the adoring, inspired poet of that same remote age, who chants in rhythmic accents the praises of a God "which doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number!" By the thinking man the God of the Hebrew Genesis is gladly relinquished for the great God of the universe, whose works proclaim him to us far more truly than can any human word.

Another, or the same, author embodies in literature the story of the Flood. With a certitude that has likewise proved convincing for untold centuries, it is related how that "it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." But a certain Jewish patriarch finds grace in the eyes of the Lord, and is by him commissioned to preserve life upon the face of the earth. And so the ark is built; and "every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, every bird of every sort, went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the

breath of life." The subsequent details of the story need no repetition here. For countless generations fathers and mothers solemnly rehearsed them to their wondering children; until at last reason, prompted by paleontology, again spoke, and the non-occurrence of a universal flood after the appearance of human life upon the earth was clearly demonstrated.

A Jewish psalmist, fired with indignation against the enemies of his God, vividly portrays, as he conceives it, the character of Jehovah. "Thine hand shall find out all thine enemies: thy right hand shall find out those that hate thee. Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them. Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth, and their seed from among the children of men. For they intended evil against thee; they imagined a mischievous device, which they are not able to perform. Therefore shalt thou make them turn their back, when thou shalt make ready thine arrows upon thy strings against the face of them. Be thou exalted, Lord, in thine own strength: so will we sing and praise thy power." For ages thereafter, that is accepted by pious souls as a true delineation of the character of God.

Again, a Jewish prophet, moved to anger by the obduracy of his people, proposes a test of prowess between himself, the sole surviving prophet of the Lord, and the prophets of Baal, four hundred and fifty in number. With dramatic impressiveness the trial is made; the God of the Hebrews vindicates his superiority; the followers of Baal are completely routed; and thus ends the story: "And when all the people saw it they fell on their faces: and they said, the Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God. And Elijah said unto them, Take the prophets of Baal, let not one of them escape. And they took them: and Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon, and slew them there."

Here is a purely tribal God victorious over another tribal God, and, actuated by obviously human instincts, establishing



his unquestioned supremacy. What persecutions, what imprisonments, what tortures, what martyrdoms have been endured by the sons of men in the name of that God, who shall dare to estimate or declare? But,

"Thanks to the human heart by which we live,  
Thanks to its tenderness, its joys, and fears,"

we have now attained to the conception of a very different God—an all-powerful, all-wise, all-just, and yet all-merciful Father—of whom anger, violence, and revenge are inconceivable attributes. The regenerate human feeling of to-day answers with a shudder of repugnance to many of the Old Testament characterizations of Deity. To us the marvel is that saying could ever have made such things even seem true. And yet, it may be remarked, there still live, in our own land and in this present year of grace, apologists of the whale story, who seek to reconstruct a monster of the deep that shall meet all the ancient specifications. Yea, more; there are those who, with an astronomical skill that puts to shame the achievements of a Kepler, are prepared to demonstrate the phenomenon immemorably associated with the name of Joshua.

In the first half of the fifth century, the good Hilary, Bishop of Arles, was moved to compose the so-called "Athanasian Creed", in which he sought to embody most explicitly the Trinitarian views of Athanasius, the great opponent of Arius. Hear its opening words: "Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." This "confession of our Christian faith" was incorporated in the English Book of Common Prayer, and its use prescribed by Church law upon some thirteen different Feast Days. For well-nigh five hundred years loyal churchmen devoutly proclaimed their faith in the terms of this extraordinary symbol. Finally, however, in the second half of the nineteenth century, an enlightened Christian consciousness asserted itself, and the prescription of

the Prayer Book became practically a dead letter. On the other hand, by a singular fatuity, the middle years of this same century witnessed the confirmation of an unbroken "Apostolic Succession" in the English hierarchy—a fact of the very existence of which hosts of good churchmen, since the days of Henry VIII., had been totally oblivious, and to which, happily, hosts of others are magisterially indifferent now. But, to those who would believe, it is the very sheet-anchor of Anglican autonomy.

Again, the Infallibility of the Pope, a moot-point for centuries, is made an article of faith in the year 1870; and good Romanists find themselves confronted by a trying dilemma. Shall they accept the say-so of canonical decree? Or shall they, with open mind, draw some seemingly unavoidable conclusions from the records of Papal acts and measures?

Once more, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, first broached by St. Bernard, and stoutly maintained by Duns Scotus and his disciples, is not received by the Roman Church, as an article of belief, until the year 1854. Not content with the doctrine of Christ's supernatural conception and birth, these fortifiers of divinity must needs go back and establish by assertion the sinless conception of the Virgin Mother herself. Curious indeed are the workings of the human mind when bent upon the accomplishment of some pre-determined purpose! "The wish is father to the thought"; the thought, in turn, becomes father to the word; and, by the fatherly offices of the word, the fact emerges into being.

Upon a thinking man, it is hardly necessary to add, measures such as these, intended to establish church authority, have an effect directly the reverse. 'Tis not, after all, the decree of Council or Synod, the edict of Pope or Bishop that constitutes authority, that challenges loyalty and devotion. Nay rather, it is the Master himself who has taught us all how to judge; and his test is delightfully simple and easy of application: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

That the mind of man could elaborate and, in all serious-

ness, inculcate the hideous doctrine of predestination, with its concomitants of election and eternal perdition; that thousands of sentient human beings could accept such doctrine and for generations suffer themselves to be thereby exalted or cast down—is of itself sufficient proof of the principle here maintained. By it an innocent, sweet-natured Cowper was hounded to a madman's grave; upon it a no less genial Lamb resolutely turned his back, and was spared to live a wholesome, rational life, struggling bravely and becoming, as any hero may, master of his fate.

In the second century of the Christian era, a certain Ptolemy of Alexandria—mathematician, geographer, astronomer—elaborated, after patient and prolonged research, a system of cosmogony, since known as the Ptolemaic theory. To his own satisfaction he proved the earth to be the centre of the universe, about which revolved the sun, moon, stars, and planets. For fourteen hundred years, to all intents and purposes, the earth *was* the centre of creation; and great was the complacency of the inhabitants thereof. Poets sang, philosophers reasoned, orators rhapsodized, in blissful ignorance of God's yet unrevealed secret.

Then arose a seer, a thinker, who, having eyes to see and an intellect to deduce, penetrated the veil that had shrouded the mystery. At the word of Copernicus, in 1543, the old order crumbled into nothingness, and a new heavens and a new earth sprang into being. The sun now became the centre of a system (one of countless many), and round it were seen to revolve, in exquisite harmony, the several planets and—our own somewhat insignificant globe. And Copernicus became, forthwith, a heartily execrated man. His teaching was revolutionary, disquieting, annoying. Astronomies had, of necessity, to be re-written, and long-cherished theories to be re-adjusted to the new helio-centric idea. Even Milton, student and scholar, writing as late as the middle of the seventeenth century, exhibits, in *The Paradise Lost*, a curious reluctance to yield his assent to the new view. He appears to waver between the old

Ptolemaic idea and the then generally accepted (by men of science, at least) Copernican theory. And poor Galileo, it will be remembered, was summoned to Rome, in the year 1633, and forced by the Inquisition to abjure the Copernican and other pernicious theories. To certain of his physical demonstrations the learned men of the church and the universities naïvely replied "These things can not be; for Aristotle distinctly taught the reverse." *Ipse dixit*, truly! 'Twas saying made it so, in spite of ocular proof to the contrary. Anent such incidents as these, one is tempted to wonder what shall be the attitude of our representative poets and ecclesiastics toward the theory of evolution in, say, the year 1960, a full century after the publication of *The Origin of Species*.

Coming down, now, to our own land, to our own time, to our own civilization, let us try to dispossess ourselves, for the nonce, of certain preconceived prejudices and inherited predilections, and, with clear, unclouded vision, venture to look at a few of our "consecrated fallacies"—as they may be happily termed.

When Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence he felt impelled, by the exigencies of time and circumstance, to propound the fundamental and "self-evident" truth: "All men are created free and equal." Verily, a beautiful sentiment, and, if one is willing or able to ignore certain self-evident facts, fundamentally true, as well. The freedom and equality of all men before the law, no man, who is sane and just, would have the hardihood, for one moment, to question. Upon this principle, as upon a firm and stable foundation, rests the fabric of civilized human society. When it is undermined or seriously weakened, the superstructure must needs totter and fall. For it good men are willing to do battle and die. It is when the principle is extended beyond these self-evident and legitimate bounds, that truth is overthrown, that mischief and confusion begin. For, to say, in any other sense than the political, that "all men are created free and equal" is to utter a palpable falsehood; to accept and

actively promulgate, or even tacitly acquiesce in, such a principle is to promote error, and complacently yield to fallacy.

The teachings of biology, the law of heredity, must be fully renounced, before one can yield assent to Jefferson's dictum. If a healthy and vigorous or a diseased and enfeebled organism may be transmitted by parents to offspring; if certain well-defined mental and moral traits are the legacy of father and mother to new-born child; how then can all men be "created free and equal?", equal, as to physical and mental endowments? free, so far as moral aptitudes are concerned? If opportunity and endeavor, if high ideals and patient cultivation, if a sound mind decently housed in a sound body through one, two, or three generations,—if all these things mean nothing, so far as the breeding of a superior human creature is concerned—then biology has taught us amiss, then the influence of environment and the law of heredity are figments of the imagination.

Viewed in this light, the dogma of human equality is not only fallacious; it is essentially evil; it is unspeakably pernicious. Because untrue and unjust, it is degrading. It cuts the nerve of high achievement; it saps the springs of intellectual distinction, of moral superiority. It operates in human society as the law of the trades-union works among craftsmen. It is, in short, the curse of democracy, which would bring down those who are essentially better to the dead level of mediocrity, and institute the reign of the universal commonplace.

So accustomed we are to look at the other side of this matter—to have our eyes blinded by the glitter of specious half truths and our ears deafened by the stentorian shout of the multitude, re-inforced by the voices of those who ought to know better but apparently do not, who ought to be better but evidently are not—that we find it difficult, even in an hour of tranquil reflection, to bring our eyes to see the other side of the truth, to compose our ears to hear the "still small voice" within.

Why, if not because of Jefferson's say-so and its logical out-

come, do educated, enlightened, and upright Americans shrink from giving any outward evidence of superiority? Why are they afraid to seem better than their fellows, in language, manners, ethical standards, conduct and views of life? We are proud to assert that Americans are the best educated, best paid, best housed, best fed, best clothed, best natured people in the world. So perhaps they are, when taken in the mass. The fact, however, remains, as those who have had the opportunity to observe will testify, that the highest type of individual character is not being developed in America—unless, forsooth, it be maintained that self-abnegation, or the sinking of oneself in the mass, is the crown and flower of human being. For the virtues of moral courage, scorn of money, independence of thought, indifference to the opinions and standards of inferior men, tranquil dignity, and imperious self-respect one must go elsewhere—to a land where all men are not and never were “created free and equal.” The characteristic virtues of a democracy we may and do exhibit; the transcendent traits of a cultivated and superior class are of necessity denied us.

The prevailing use of the words “lady” and “gentleman” is a sufficient illustration of the principle under discussion. A sort of barometer it is, that indicates the condition of the social atmosphere in which we live. The noble word “woman” is obsolescent among us, and bids fair to become, within a generation, totally obsolete. The honest word “man” is likewise losing vogue. On the basis of the Declaration all our men have become gentlemen, all our women, ladies. There are those who view this with indifference, or who see in it only material for ridicule and laughter. But, surely, there is in it much to startle and confound. For what does it all mean? We are enslaved to a fallacy. Few of us have the courage to use the word “man,” fewer still the word “woman,” for just what it means and just where it belongs. We have suffered the word “lady” to be so abused that it has come finally to mean absolutely nothing. It has lost its function, and is now little more than a synonym for female. “Gentleman,”

too, has forfeited much of its ancient dignity, and signifies little or nothing as one hears it used to-day. But what should concern us most is, that, with the giving up of verbal distinction, goes inevitably the relinquishment of what the words formerly connoted. When ladies and gentlemen are constituted by the say-so of flippant speech, we know how cheap and shoddy and pitiable the finished product must of necessity be. In our thinking and our striving we need to keep before us the old-time ideals, would we appreciate and achieve the reality.

On January 1, 1863, President Lincoln, as commander-in-chief of the armies of the United States, declared as a military measure, in accordance with notice proclaimed September 22, 1862, that within certain specified territory in armed rebellion, all persons held as slaves "are and henceforward shall be free." All honor to the sainted Lincoln for his wisdom, courage, and magnanimity! His act has been sufficiently celebrated in song and story, by statesman, publicist, orator, and moralist. Theoretically, it was great and glorious—one of those spectacular strokes of statesmanship which dazzle the popular mind. To this day we hear the shackles dropping from the negro's limbs, we behold the slave metamorphosed freeman, assuming the rights and prerogatives of full-fledged citizenship.

But, marvelous as was the achievement, we know that this was not the plan devised by Lincoln's wisdom and approved by his sober judgment. No, in the light of subsequent history—painful history, made during two-score years and more—we, who are still confronted by the negro problem, who are still wrestling with the heritage of that memorable proclamation, may be permitted to regret that Lincoln's original policy was not suffered to prevail. We may be pardoned for deploring the military or partisan exigencies which seemed to make necessary this political *tour de force*. We recognize the impossibility of making the African and the slave, by a simple stroke of the pen, the equal of the free-born American; we



are heartily sorry that the method of gradual emancipation, as practised in most of the original northern States, in the British and Spanish West Indies, and in Brazil, could not have been put into execution. For then might have been achieved what education and civilization—the slow, patient, persistent effort of many years—alone can accomplish. Forty-three years have elapsed, and the negro of the South is not free to-day. In no sense is he the white man's equal; even his political and legal rights are not respected. What he is in the North we know to our sorrow.

Indeed, as a people, we are too prone to put our trust in words, edicts, acts, and proclamations. We are enamored of the fallacy that "Saying makes things so." Our entire fabric—political, economic, social—is honeycombed by it. We pin our faith to tariff schedules and customs duties; we take delight in Sunday laws and all manner of blue laws; in laws that prohibit the sale of spirituous liquors and the use of cigarettes; in laws which any self-respecting man instinctively resents, because they assail personal liberty; and then, having countenanced the passing of all these laws, we serenely suffer them to be broken one by one. Dare we resent too hotly the facetious foreigner's query "Do the Americans keep any of their laws but the Divorce Law and Lynch Law?" We issue from our mints a huge and pretentious-looking coin, which we call a dollar. We know it to be worth, intrinsically, about forty-five cents. On the obverse side we place a Liberty head, on the reverse, a spread-eagle, and between its wings, the legend: "In God we Trust." The nations of the civilized world, however, considered the disparity between nominal and real value too great; and, in consequence, we have wisely concluded, in matters of exchange, to adhere to the gold standard.

Matthew Arnold was a shrewd observer, a keen critic, an honest thinker, and withal a frank and just, yet kindly man. In his criticism of his own countrymen he was always serious and outspoken, often severe and searching. Among certain glaring defects exhibited by men of his day, and notably by

religious thinkers and leaders, he remarked a certain "want of intellectual seriousness," which, in his opinion, led often to disastrous and lamentable results. By this intellectual seriousness he meant an honest, straightforward attempt to "see things as they really are," an "unimpeded play of thought" about a subject, in the earnest endeavor to arrive at inherent and essential truth. With vehement insistence he pleaded for the cultivation of the "intellectual conscience," a faculty, he maintained, hardly more than rudimentary in the Anglo-Saxon type. "The word conscience," he declares, "has become almost confined, in popular use, to the moral sphere, because this lively susceptibility of feeling is, in the moral sphere, so far more common than in the intellectual sphere; the livelier, in the moral sphere, this susceptibility is, the greater becomes a man's readiness to admit a high standard of action, an ideal authoritatively correcting his everyday moral habits; here, such willing admission of authority is due to sensitiveness of conscience. And a like deference to a standard higher than one's own habitual standard in intellectual matters, a like respectful recognition of a superior ideal is caused, in the intellectual sphere, by sensitiveness of intelligence." And, again, he says: "The mass of mankind will never have any ardent zeal for seeing things as they are; very inadequate ideas will always satisfy them. On these inadequate ideas reposes, and must repose, the general practice of the world. That is as much as saying that whoever sets himself to see things as they are will find himself one of a very small circle; but it is only by this small circle resolutely doing its own work that adequate ideas will ever get current at all."

Surely, the crying need of our own day, as it was of Arnold's, is an intellectual evangel, a crusade which will arouse men to think before they say, allege, proclaim; a quickening of the intellectual conscience, which will impel them to know "the best that is known and thought in the world," and by that knowledge instinctively reject the inferior, the tawdry, the untrue. A Torrey and Alexander mission may be neces-

sary; an Arnold mission, if it might serve to arouse us from our intellectual lethargy, would be even more beneficial. For, what we need, above all things, to cultivate is "a free play of thought upon our routine notions," what we shall do well, at all times, carefully to inquire is "whether the light we have be the best light that can be obtained; or whether, perchance, it be not darkness."

LANCASTER, PENNA.

## II.

### IS DIVINE AND REVEALED RELIGION WITHIN THE SCOPE OF SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS AND STATEMENT?\*

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, D.D.

Before attempting an answer to the question, here propounded, it may be well to look for a definition of the terms employed. It is true, we use all of them in our common speech, as if their meaning were perfectly clear; yet, it is to be feared, we do not always weigh their meaning as carefully as we ought. As a consequence, our conceptions often lack precision.

1. What do we mean by divine and revealed religion? There is a sense in which all religion, so far as it contains a knowledge of God, is revealed; and all religions do contain some knowledge of God. There is not a religion which does not contain an idea of a Supreme Being; and though the idea may be overlaid by superstition and error, it contains some light with reference to things divine. And inasmuch as God can be known only as He manifests Himself to us, it follows that there must be some form of revelation in all ethnic religions. To this truth Paul refers, when he says, "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God manifests it unto them. For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made even His everlasting power and divinity" (Rom. 1: 19, 20).

If ethnic religions thus contain an element of revelation and divinity, we can certainly affirm no less of Judaism. All

\* A paper read before the Reformed Ministerial Association of Lancaster. Published by request.

who believe in the decalogue, believe that God spake on Sinai. We believe that He spake unto the fathers by the prophets. It was, it is true, "by divers portions and in divers manners," as they were able to receive it; yet it was most real. The religion of Israel was both divine and revealed—in these respects far in advance of the religions of the Gentile peoples round about them.

And yet even in the religion of Israel the revelation of God was both fragmentary and imperfect. It pointed to something beyond itself. The God, who spoke to Israel by the prophets "by divers portions and in divers manners" had a still richer and fuller manifestation of Himself in store for His people. He hath in these last days spoken unto us in His Son. He is the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the very image His substance (Heb. 1: 3); so that all who have seen Him, in the sense of recognizing who and what He is, have seen the Father. And by the side of the revelation, which is given in Him, all other revelation, even that through Moses and the prophets, fades into insignificance; and all other religions appear as no religions by the side of that which contains this revelation through the Son. By divine and revealed religion we hence assume that the religion of Jesus Christ is meant.

2. What do we mean by scientific analysis? Science has been defined as "knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking"; again as "an exact and systematic statement of knowledge concerning some subject or group of subjects." It is knowledge gained by observation; it may afterwards be verified by correct thinking; but its starting point is observation. Now, observation presupposes facts; and hence science must ultimately rest upon facts. Systems of thought may be built upon speculation; they may be built upon pure hypotheses; but unless the hypotheses are verified by facts, the systems, which are built upon them, can have no claim to the title of science. And they never stand the test of time. Any system of knowledge, deserving the

name of science, must rest upon a broad and patient induction of facts; and the facts must enter our knowledge through experience.

3. Another preliminary observation ought to be made on the word analysis. Analysis consists in the resolution of any object, whether of sense or intellect, into its constituent elements. An ultimate fact, like a simple substance, does not admit of analysis. Before a thing can come within the scope of analysis, it must be composed of constituent elements, which can be separated, and separately apprehended.

And scientific analysis implies that a fact or group of facts be resolved into their constituent elements; that the fact or group of facts, together with their constituent elements, be made the subject of accurate observation; and that the knowledge, thus obtained, be accurately verified by correct thinking.

Now, taking Christianity as the only religion to which we can ultimately apply the terms revealed and divine, does it come within the scope of such analysis? Is it composed of such constituent elements as can be separated and made the subject of accurate observation? And can the knowledge, which is gained by such observation, be so verified by correct thinking as to bring it within the scope of true scientific statement?

This, as I understand it, is the meaning of the question, which this association has propounded to me. And to the question, as thus stated, I would return both an affirmative and a negative answer, according to the limits which it is proposed to set for the observation and the analysis. The answer will be negative, if the demand is to make the observation and the analysis comprehensive and final; but affirmative, if, as is done in all other science, the analysis is allowed to proceed on the basis of such observations as can be made by our limited and imperfect experiences.

Such a thing as a comprehensive and final analysis is possible in very few, if any, of the sciences. There is probably no fact or group of facts, which have been so fully, so ac-

curately observed that there remains nothing further to be learned about them; and hence there is no science which is complete or final. A text-book on science, which is ten or twenty years old, is for that reason nearly always out of date. And what is true of botany and geology—sciences, whose object is so nearly within the reach of human observation,—must of course be true of theology—a science whose subject of necessity transcends the reach both of our observation and of our comprehension. And hence, if the object is to bring Christianity within the scope of scientific statement and analysis in such sense as to enable us to construct a finished, a complete, and a final scientific statement of its meaning and contents, we must answer your question in the negative. There can be no such thing as a final scientific statement of Christian doctrine, which can be transmitted from age to age, to be accepted by each succeeding generation without question or restatement. Here as in all the sciences, we should rather say more than in all the other sciences, each generation is bound to test, to verify, and to restate the statements of all preceding generations, and to subject its own religious experiences as well as the religious experiences of all preceding generations to new tests, and on the basis of its own living observations to restate them for itself.

But if by the scope of scientific analysis and statement of Christian doctrine nothing more is meant than in the case of all the other sciences, we would answer the question unhesitatingly in the affirmative. The Christian religion is a great and glorious fact. It has touched our humanity in its profoundest depths. It has influenced and changed the course of history. It has uplifted, ennobled and purified our human life. It has given us new and higher ideas of God. It has placed before us a perfect ideal of our human life in the person of its Founder. And in Him it has given us such an embodiment of truth, virtue and goodness, that we now have the full and final revelation of the divine.

And these facts are open to our observation. They have



entered into our human experiences as really as any set of facts which can be mentioned. And in as far as they have entered into the experience of our common humanity, they may be made the subject of as careful, as accurate, and as scientific observation and research as any set of facts, which come within the reach of our experience. They are composite facts, which can be resolved into their elements, and hence come within the scope both of scientific analysis and statement. Theology may be just as really a science as geology or botany.

In making this statement, it may, however, be well to note carefully the conditions on which such scientific analysis and statement of religious truth must proceed.

1. And here we would state as our first proposition that theology, in order to be scientific, must rest upon facts. Pure speculation has no more place here than it has in geography or botany. Hypotheses may be employed for the sake of setting forth truth in a systematic and orderly form, just as hypotheses are employed in all other sciences; but the hypotheses must be tested and verified by correct and careful observation of facts. Where a sufficient number of undoubted facts support and confirm the hypotheses, they may become part of the accepted scientific statement of religious truth; but where this is not the case, they can have no claim to anything better than creations of the imagination, perhaps interesting in themselves, but of absolutely no value for the scientific statement of divine truth.

And such facts for scientific observation and analysis are found in abundance in the religious experience of mankind. As above stated, religion is a fact. The Christian religion is a great and glorious fact. It centers in a historic person, Jesus Christ our Lord. That He lived and taught and died and rose again is as well established as any fact in human history. His own religious experience has become part of the religious experience of mankind. What He thought and felt with reference to God and man's relation to God has become a

fact of history, and has been transmitted to all generations through His words and deeds just as really as what Socrates taught and felt has been transmitted to us. And the life and teaching of Jesus Christ have profoundly influenced the history of mankind. His work and His teachings have started a religious movement among men, more powerful than any other that has ever been known. Men and women in all ages and climes have been singularly affected by this movement. Countless lives have been changed, purified, ennobled, and sanctified by His influence. His teaching has given peace to troubled consciences the world over. And He has just as profoundly influenced the social and political life of mankind. All our social and ethical ideals have been purified and ennobled by His teaching. Much as we may deplore the social and political corruption about us to-day, there is scarcely a comparison between the condition of society in these particulars to-day and that of society at the time of His advent. One only needs to go through the ruins of Pompeii and allow his guide to open to him the little closets in which are hidden the obscenities which once were openly exhibited in that wicked city, to have incontestable proof of this statement.

Now these, and thousands of similar facts, belonging to the religious experiences of our Christian centuries, form a basis for scientific investigation, as really as the rocks, and the plants, and the fauna of the earth form the basis for scientific investigation in the sphere of natural science. And they form the basis and furnish the material for a scientific theology just as really as plants and animals furnish the basis and the materials for the sciences of botany and zoology.

2. These facts must enter into human experience before they can be made the basis of scientific investigation and analysis. It need not necessarily be my experience or your experience, but it must be the experience of some member of the human family. It may be the experience of that unique person, who stood in an altogether unique relation to God, and who has originated and given impulse to that entire

religious phenomenon, which we call Christianity. It matters not how the fact has entered into the experience of mankind, the point is that it must in some way have entered into the experience of the race, before it can become the subject of scientific investigation or statement.

And that the Christian revelation has thus entered into the experience of the race is a fact which can not be doubted. To take but three illustrations out of the entire realm of Christian theology, we readily perceive how Christ's conception of the divine Fatherhood, how God's acknowledgement of Jesus as the Christ, and how the atonement affected by Christ have become facts of human experience.

Jesus taught His disciples in coming to the throne of grace to say "Our Father, who art in heaven." He Himself had the consciousness of standing in a unique filial relation to God. As a child, twelve years old, He said, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" and as a man, he habitually addressed God as, "Father," or "My Father." The term expressed His own, inmost and deepest religious experience. And the term, "Our Father," placed into the lips of his followers, expresses a similar religious experience in the hearts of his followers. There is something in the bosom of mankind which responds just as intuitively and just as unerringly to the light which is shed upon our hearts by that term, as there is something in our eyes to respond to the light of the sun in the heavens. That God is our Father has become a part of the undoubted experience of mankind; and it is hence a fact which may be subjected to scientific tests and analysis, just as much as any other fact of human experience.

Again, at the Jordan and on the mount of transfiguration, we are told, there was a voice from heaven, saying, "Thou art my Son." We are not now concerned about the manner in which that voice was heard. Was it an outward, audible voice, speaking ordinary human words as we do, or was it an inner voice addressing itself to the conscience?—are questions which need not here concern us. The question is, Has

humanity heard that voice? Is there a sense in which that divine attestation has entered into human experience? We think there is. God spake in the words of wisdom which fell from the lips of Jesus. These were of the very essence of divine truth and goodness. God spoke in His deeds of beneficent kindness. Above all has He spoken in Christian history. For nineteen centuries the spiritually dead have been quickened into life, those who were "dead in sin and torpid" have learned to live decently, men and women everywhere have been restored to their right minds, love instead of selfishness has become the guiding star of countless lives—and all because of what He is to the race. Through all these facts God has been acknowledging Him as His Son. And through all these facts the race has heard the words, once spoken on the mount, "This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him."

Again: take the great fact of the atonement. Has that entered the experience of the race? We might appeal to the experience of St. Paul, how that inner conflict, described in the 7th of Romans, has been won in Christ, and how in Christ he attained peace with God. But has not that experience been reproduced in the lives of many, many thousands since then? Study the biography of Augustine, Luther, Bunyan, and of many others; analyze your own religious experience; and is not that substantially true of us all? Whatever our theory of the atonement may be, the fact has become a part of the common religious experience of God's people.

3. But this leads us to make still another affirmation. Divine and revealed religion are within the scope of scientific analysis and statement only for those who have part in this experience. The man who has no part in this experience may indeed study religious phenomena, as these are found in the experience of others and in the experience of the race; he may collect a number of the facts, and he may succeed in arranging them in a quasi-scientific form. But he will be without the key for a correct interpretation of the facts. As well might a blind man, who has never had the experience of sight,

undertake to study the science of optics and to explain the phenomena of light, as an unregenerate man, who has never had the experience of God's grace in his heart, the study and interpretation of the religious phenomena and experiences of God's people.

And if this be true, then two corollaries must follow:

1. A necessary equipment for the scientific apprehension and statement of divine and revealed religion is such an inner harmony with the truth as comes from a willing obedience to the divine will. This, as we all know, is the test which Jesus gave to the Jews. "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself" (Jn. 7: 17). For the scientific theologian the first requisite is an obedient will, not a brilliant intellect. Of course, the latter is needful; for a man who does not have trained powers of observation, the ability of sustained and accurate thinking, the mental grasp which can take in facts in their wholeness and in their relation, and the power of insight to see things as they are, can not be a successful theologian. No goody-goody imbecile, with good intentions, is fit for the task of the scientific statement and analysis of the Christian religion. A strong and well trained intellect is, of course, a necessary equipment. But the point, which I want to make, is that that is not primary. A deeper quality is needed. The theologian must first of all be in such inner moral and spiritual harmony with his subject as will enable him to see and know when the truth is openly set before his eyes. He must have the power of spiritual vision, before he can have the power of accurately observing, analyzing, and classifying spiritual facts and phenomena.

2. And this suggests a second corollary. The scientific apprehension and statement of spiritual truth must go hand in hand with the moral and spiritual regeneration of mankind. The race will reach a perfect apprehension of the truth when it has attained to a state of perfect obedience. Until then its apprehension must be as partial as its obedience.

It follows that, while there may be a provisional analysis and statement of the truths of revealed religion, there can be no final or finished statement in our present imperfect state. As each age has its own moral and social problems to solve, so must each age have its own theological problems. It can not rest in the theological definitions of a past generation. There can be no greater folly than the attempt to bind any generation by the theological formulas of the past. As the race grows morally and spiritually, it must grow intellectually; and unless theology keeps pace with the spiritual progress of the age, it will not simply lose its influence, but it must necessarily stagnate and die. The saddest spectacle of the ages is the theologian, who sits on the graves of his forefathers rattling their bones, and mechanically repeating their dogmatic statements. Theology must grow; as it grows, it must change; in its changes it must slough off the dead and worn-out definitions and confessional statements of the past. With its face toward God and heaven, it must be open to every new light that breaks from His Word; and it must hold itself in readiness to welcome and interpret every new religious experience, which the God of wisdom and grace may be pleased to vouchsafe to His people.

Of course, this does not mean that there has been any change in the eternal verities of our Christian faith. They are yea and amen forever. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever; and He is the same personal Saviour for me that He was for Peter and John. His saving deeds have the same efficacy for us as for the Christians of the Apostolic age; but our apprehension of His adorable person and of the significance of those saving deeds are very different. Indeed, it can not be otherwise. The Apostles' apprehension of His person and of the meaning of His acts was very different before and after His resurrection. To this John testifies: "These things understood not His disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these

things unto Him" (Jn. 12:16). The death, the resurrection, the glorification of Jesus, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit were new experiences for the disciples; and in the light of those experiences they attained a new and deeper apprehension of His glorious person. He Himself remained the same person; but their apprehension of Him changed. So with us. Nineteen centuries of Christian history have given us many new manifestations of His saving power and grace. Each one of these manifestations constituted a new experience for the Church; and each new experience gave to her a new glimpse of his glory. He has continued the same Lord throughout all the changes; His Spirit has continued the same Spirit of truth and grace; and the truth, unto which He has been leading all the successive generations of Christians, has continued the same truth. But His people have been led by Him, and they are being led by Him now. As he opened their minds, they saw ever more and more clearly; and with the clearer vision they were enabled to state and to restate their dogmatic definitions in ever clearer and clearer form. And so the process must go on from age to age, until, with the moral and spiritual perfection of the Christian life, we shall see Him as He is. Then, when we shall, with unveiled face, behold His glory, having ourselves been transformed into the same image from glory to glory, we shall know even as we are known. Then, but not until then, may the theologian expect to formulate a scientific statement of Christian doctrine that shall need no restatement; then, but not until then, may the Church expect to compose a confession of faith that shall need no revision.



### III.

## SOME ASPECTS OF THE RELIGION OF SOPHOKLES.

N. P. VLACHOS, PH.D.

The renewed activity that of late has manifested itself in the study of Greek religion has not equally extended over all its provinces. It is the older strata of Greek religion—primitive religious conceptions and archaic rites, that now mainly claim the attention of scholars; the Greek authors are principally studied as antiquarian depositories. But the individual religious beliefs of the great Greek poets receive but scant attention; and this in spite of the generally acknowledged fact that many of the great poets were the exponents and representatives of their national faith in its highest form of development and constituted a sort of religious prophetism among their people. The reason for this comparative neglect is, however, fairly obvious. Our evidence for popular beliefs and superstitions is constantly being added to; researches in other than purely "classical" fields, especially the labors of anthropologists have totally changed the aspect of Greek religion. But our evidence for the individual religion of each of the Greek poets is substantially the same to-day as it was three hundred years ago.

And therefore to open anew the question of Sophokles' religion may seem an unprofitable proceeding. And yet,—granted that our evidence has not appreciably increased, has not our point of view considerably changed? The latest exhaustive treatment of the subject is some twenty-five years old,\* and written at a time when it was but too common to look upon Greek religion as a worship of various personified aspects of nature, with an ethical admixture, the whole being

\* E. Abbott, "Theology and Ethics of Sophocles" in *Hellenica*.

measured by Christian standards. Assuredly, the extension of our knowledge of popular beliefs must also affect our estimate of the individual belief of a Sophokles.

Again, the study of popular beliefs, dealing as it does chiefly with the intellectual side of the religious consciousness holds out greater hopes of definite results to be obtained. But in endeavoring to determine the precise character of the religion of a poet like Sophokles we are confronted with difficulties that may well seem insuperable. Sophokles has left us no confession of faith. We have no evidence outside of his dramas, and for obvious reasons we should be cautious in using their contents,—utterances put in the mouth of the actors,—as evidence for the poet's personal belief. And the testimony of his dramas is not only of uncertain character, it is also fragmentary. Again, a merely mechanical method, the rigorous application of a certain set of rules may establish a few facts,—it cannot lead to an adequate realization of the true nature of that complicated aggregate of emotional and intellectual factors that go to make up the religious consciousness. The final interpretation of the facts in questions of this kind becomes largely a matter of intuition; consequently our views are subjective and there remains considerable room for difference of opinion. But if exact and positive knowledge on such points is beyond our reach, we can at least strive to make some progress in the desired direction.

In the present paper such an effort is made—an endeavor to bring nearer to us the religious personality of Sophokles, at least in some of its aspects, which, it is hoped, may contribute to a nicer appreciation of his dramas as works of a distinctly religious art.

Former writers on the subject have laid undue stress on the ethical element in Sophokles' religion. They began their inquiries, often perhaps unconsciously, by comparing Sophokles to his great predecessor, and invariably tried to determine the position of the one poet with reference to that occupied by the other. Now, in Aischylos the

question of theodicy is undoubtedly paramount. Consequently, when it came to be determined whether Sophokles' drama, from a religious point of view, constitutes an advance on or a retrogression from Aischylos, it was the connection between sin and suffering that was first inquired into. Then it would become plain that Sophokles did not perceive justice operating in a simple and direct way in God's dealings with man. Some writers, indeed, affirmed that the innocence of the Sophoklean sufferers was only apparent, and set themselves to prove the existence of some "guilt" or other on the part of an Oidipus, Antigone, Philoktetes, Deianeira. Others, while accepting the disproportion between the suffering of Sophokles' heroes and heroines and their guilt, attributed this to a profounder moral earnestness on the part of the poet, and to his closer observation of the facts of life. They affirmed that he "identified the empire of Zeus with an order of the world which is just and good"; they spoke of "redemption" and pointed to Oidipus; thus the gods finally made amends to Philoktetes; and Antigone's death was set down as "her constancy's reward." Again, there was found in Sophokles "an approach to that doctrine which the Hebrews learned in their captivity, of the blessedness of sorrow." Others, rejecting this mode of interpretation, for which not a particle of evidence can be found in Sophokles' works, thought that a child-like faith in the goodness and justice of the divine power characterises Sophokles and distinguishes him from Aischylos, —the faith of the pious to whom it is sufficient to perceive the hand of God, to make them adore and worship Him. Finally evidence has been found in some of his dramas of a mind strongly inclined toward a fatalistic view of life.

With all these writers it is the starting point that is at fault. Sophokles holds no place among the thinkers of Greece. His religion should be approached on its emotional, not on its intellectual side.

I would lay down as the fundamental truth from which to proceed, that Sophokles is almost wholly, if not exclusively,

swayed by his emotions, in all matters religious. The religious emotion,—so strong in him that it may fitly be called one of the constituent parts of his being,—consists primarily in man's consciousness that he is in the power of a being or beings whom he reveres as the all-powerful and supreme.\* Since, then, the emotions are the dominating factor in his spiritual life, we should cease to look in his works for a clear-cut and well-thought-out doctrine regarding the divine; there is simply a broad and deep *feeling of god*. For his is the "religiosity" of the poet and artist; the speculations and theorizing of the theologian are foreign to his spirit.

Indeed, inherent in Sophokles' religion is its intellectual weakness; his religion is made up of the most glaringly incongruous elements,—the noblest aspirations and the belief in a god, commanding matricide, stand side by side. The last to build up a new system of theology, he did not even attempt to purge traditional belief from the lower elements it contained. Incapable of any such intellectual effort, he merely adapts to his personal needs what he finds at his disposal,—and that without exercising his reason in differentiating between the true and the false.

But if the intellect had little share in guiding his vague apprehensions and indefinite longings to a firmer conception of the divine,—how much greater was the scope he unconsciously allowed to his sense of wonder. Reverence and wonder lie at the basis of all that deserves the name of religion†; the sense of mystery is an indispensable element in the mental make-up of all religious persons,—in most confined within reasonable limits, but apt to run riot in people of one-sided emotional nature. This is just what happened in Sophokles' case. His sense of the mysterious was developed to a degree bordering on the abnormal; he seems to have felt a positive need of being moved by his gods to wonder and awe; a strange delight in suffering himself to be mystified by such decrees

\* C. P. Tiele, "Elements of the Science of Religion," II., p. 19.

† Carlyle.

and manifestations of the divine power as baffled all human understanding; there existed in him a natural predisposition to discover a mysterious supernatural cause at work where to others a rational explanation sufficed.

For an illustration of this mental tendency on his part, let us examine his version of Deianeira's story. To the author of the *Medea* the jealousy of the heroine, culminating in a murderous deed, would have formed the center of interest. Not so with Sophokles. The element most strongly appealing to him was not the human but the divine element in the story; this he found in the fact that Deianeira slew her husband *unwittingly*. For that made the story another illustration of the contrast between appearance and reality, between the meaning of events as seen by man, and as designed by god. Forever prone to discern the hand of god, Sophokles nowhere detects the silent and mysterious influence of the deity more readily than where there is so striking a contrast between the end the human will aims at and that which it in fact achieves. Now, there are two innovations in Sophokles' version of the story. The first of these is the oracles,—one relating to the time, the other to the manner of Herakles' death. Both oracles may be safely set down as the pious invention of the poet. They go to prove that he wished to impress upon his audience that the fatal mistake of Deianeira was not merely an accident, but an event decreed by god and brought about by god, so that at the close of the play Hyllos may speak of the "sorrows manifold and strange; and in all this there is nought but Zeus,"—that is, as Professor Jebb explains, Zeus is manifested in each and all of these events. Where others, then, would have spoken of an "irony of fate," there Sophokles introduced oracles and felt the mysterious influence of an unseen presence.

The other innovation concerns Deianeira. To the mind of the average Athenian her name may have brought with it a suggestion of ferocity. In Sophokles' hands she grew into "a perfect type of gentle womanhood" (Jebb). Contrary to all legend, he placed her marriage at an early period of Herakles'

life, before he had performed the labors for Eurystheus. Thus all the fears and anxieties of the devoted wife who knows her husband constantly exposed to grave perils, fell to her lot; these were the ties that bound her to her husband. "From youth upwards she has endured constant anxieties relieved only by gleams of happiness,—the rare and brief visits of Heracles to his home" (Jebb). Whatever act of disloyalty to her Heracles has been guilty of, she has condoned and against this new rival, who is to share her home, she feels no hatred, no bitterness even; she only wishes to retain the place that is hers by right of these many years of devotion and suffering.

What, now, caused Sophokles to depart so widely from tradition? We may judge of the cause by the effect attained; such portrayal of Deianeira immeasurably heightened the appalling significance of that "unwittingly." The mystery in which the whole episode is shrouded is deepened; god chose the gentlest hand to strike the most cruel blow.

But the mystical pantheism of Sophokles is only a feeling of god, a rather vague consciousness of the omnipresence of the divine, which makes no attempt to draw a clear line between human will and divine agency. And throughout the *Trachiniæ* there is no hint even that the question as to the motive of the terrible deity ever suggested itself to the poet's mind. He only bids the spectator feel the presence of that Ineffable Something there, and wonder, and be humble.

This sense of wonder will mainly account for his profound consciousness of human limitations, keener in him perhaps than in any other Greek, and for the meek submission of his reason to what it takes to be the hidden counsels of God. His attitude towards this god, with whom man cannot and may not reason became one of *unqualified submission*. And again, closely connected with his sense of the mysterious is his consciousness of the "Nichtigkeit" of human life; for man is moving in utter darkness, entirely at the mercy of a power

whose ways are past understanding; therefore human life is all uncertainty.

But it will be readily understood that the open, crude and violent interference of the gods in human affairs in which former generations had believed, meant little or nothing to Sophokles. Scholars have rightly observed in Herodotus an inclination "to contract the limits of the Supernatural." This observation would also hold good of Sophokles, who had so much in common with the historian. At the same time these limits are indefinitely expanded. Sophokles eliminates all manifestation of the divine power, showing itself in rude and sudden disturbance of existing order. God's work is not to be perceived by the human eye; not by the senses; it is rather to be apprehended, dimly felt by the heart. For not by outward visible act, but in a subtle mysterious way, evading rational analysis, God works out his will. And, therefore, since he naturally discerns the divine everywhere, the scope of the divine agency is indefinitely expanded, God's influence pervading the entire sphere of human life. The clear daylight in which gods and men move in the Homeric poems is replaced in the Sophoclean drama by a twilight where all outline is dimmed, all movement assumes a mysterious aspect.\*

\* The *Elektra* forms the only exception; here for once god stands outside; this accounts for the Homeric qualities of the play, which have often been noted. But Sophokles' version of the story is a purely conventional one, with its calm condonation of matricide. Conventional is also the *deus ex machina* in the *Philoktetes*, and the prologue of the *Aias*. Yet, even in the *Philoktetes* we have the truly Sophoclean contrast between appearance and reality; the councils of Zeus reserved the wretched outcast as the saviour of the Greeks. And in the *Aias* the conventional Athena is speedily dropped and the dark, nameless power that plays such an appalling rôle in the lives of the Sophoclean heroes is once more in control. After his madness is past, Aias still labors under the divine influence, *θεία μανία ξύναυλος* (611), as the chorus surmises. And we are informed in so many words by the seer Kalchas. Here again we have an innovation of Sophokles' hand,—a peculiar touch, characteristic of the poet, and strikingly parallel to the one in the *Trachiniae*, noted above. Sophokles again refuses to present Aias' deed in its purely human aspects; not only a sense of shame and despair drove the hero



There is a wide gulf separating the "naïf" belief of the Homeric man in his humanized gods from the mystical pantheism of a Sophokles.

But feeling the immediate presence of his god, he not only must have been constantly on the alert for a sign, be it in dream or portent, to guide his conduct; not only must have desired to draw near to that power, easily offended, to propitiate its anger and win its favor,—but at times must have felt an imperative need to lose himself in God, his own will in that of the Deity, to feel at one with it, in order to attain the "blessedness" and peace of mind of the truly religious man,—a need that may have found its fittest expression in devout acts of worship.

This is the mystic side of his religion. Indicative of this tendency towards mysticism are the reverence in which he holds the utterances of the Pythia, the mouthpiece of Apollo; his reverence for Teiresias, the inspired prophet; his belief in the potency of dreams in conveying the will of the deity; the veneration in which he holds the Eleusinian mysteries. Additional evidence is contained in the scholium on *Elektra* 831, "he was a most pious man," which can only mean that Sophokles had been known to discharge his religious duties with scrupulous zeal. Tiele has justly observed that "worship always involves a certain mystic element," and that "worship must be pervaded with a genuine and healthy mysticism, it must be inspired with belief, without which it is nothing."\* Close observance of the ritual may, indeed, be due to various causes; and there is no reasonable doubt but

to suicide, but there was added an influence from above. But the character of that baleful influence does not even remotely suggest the personality of Athena, and is essentially the same as that which vexed the mind of Antigone and drove her to her doom. For that Sophokles found in Antigone's frenzied despair an indication of the supernatural, of the heaven-sent *δῆρ* that had dwelt so long with the Labdacids and made the history of that house a record of violent deeds,—that I have tried to show elsewhere. ("The Subject of Sophokles' Antigone," Philadelphia, 1901.)

\* "Elements," II., 142, 153.

that also in Sophokles an attitude of "caution towards the gods"† was a powerful factor in prompting him to do his duty by the gods. At the same time we are safe in ascribing his zeal in matters pertaining to worship primarily to a genuine religious emotion which, thus expressed, is more or less mystical in its tendencies. The most conclusive evidence of this mental tendency is furnished by the *O. K.* Throughout the play the immediate presence of the divine is felt, and that in the person of Oidipus. The deity does not appear in bodily form, the human eye beholds nothing. But Oidipus *inwardly* feels the divine promptings and perceives the voice of god. By inspiration he holds the knowledge of such things as are mysteries, which speech may not profane (1526). This spirit of mysticism has found powerful expression especially in the last scene. Oidipus, the blind one, formerly dependent on the guidance of others, now leads the way; the summons which had come from the god† urges him on; no one is to touch him and slowly he disappears from view: god in Oidipus.‡

Edward Caird has admirably characterized mysticism as "the great means whereby a religious principle supplements the defects of its own imperfect development and anticipates the results of a more advanced stage than it has yet attained."§ Such characterization exactly fits this phase of Sophokles' religion; in his moments of religious exaltation pure intuition may have allowed him to catch a glimpse of the Eternal, glorious beyond the ordinary conceptions of his time. Nevertheless, his religion, lacking the solid foundation of reason, is only a feeble attempt to reconcile what could not be reconciled; a compromise of so confused a nature that it could satisfy none but the simple-minded, an irrational "combination of the inwardness of subjective feeling and the objectivity of tradition."||

\* ἡ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐλάβεια; the expression occurs [Dem.] 59, 74.

† τοὺς θεοὺς παρόν (1540).

‡ For Bacchic ecstasies and mysticism cp. *Trach.* 216 ff.

§ *The Evolution of Religion*, II., p. 290.

|| O. Pfleiderer, *The Philosophy of Religion* (E. T.), IV, p. 238.

We have allowed in Sophokles a wide scope to his sense of wonder. Only little reflection is needed to reveal the fact, generally overlooked, how truly immense and manifold the material was which stimulated this sense of wonder. And here reference is not made to the irrational elements in myths and legends but primarily to every-day religious practice and to ideas still widely current in those days, survivals of an earlier stage in religious development.

There is, to begin with, the "taboo" idea, a sentiment springing, as it seems, from man's instinctive need to distinguish between actions permissible and such as must not be done under any circumstances, a feeling that sets apart certain things and surrounds them with an imaginary wall of sacredness. Closely connected with it is the primitive idea of ceremonial purity and impurity. In this way the ethical consciousness found utterance but sanctioned its mandates on religious, i. e., supernatural grounds. The twofold meaning of "agos,"—not due to its being derived from two different roots, as was once erroneously supposed,—is sufficient evidence that this primitive sentiment once held powerful sway over the Greek mind. The tabooed thing is a thing set apart, either as an object of religious veneration or of religious horror. Oidipus, guilty of parricide and incest, is a tabooed person; he may be morally innocent; it does not alter the fact that his person is a menace to the community in which he dwells. The transmissibility of taboo is a principle firmly believed in. Whatever comes in contact with the tabooed person is in turn infected; even sight polluted.\* Thus the primi-

\* This explains the horror of the chorus in the *O. K.* (220 ff.), when they know whom they are looking upon; and at the close of the play they pray that, having seen Oidipus, they may not have to suffer for it: μηδ' ἄλλοισιν ἀνδρ' ἰδὼν ἀκερδῇ χάριν μετασχοίμι πως (1483). Oidipus himself speaks of his κῆρα δυσπρόσιπτον (285). The same adjective is applied to the dream of Klytāimēstra: δυσπρόσιπτ' ἐνείματα (*El.* 460), in which connection we remember Aisch. *Pera* 201 f., where Atossa, after her dream purifies herself: χερσὶν καλλιερρόνυ ἐψάνασθαι πηγῆς. To avoid pollution, Laios' attendant leaves Thebes after the slayer of his master had occupied the

tive mind could not think of moral guilt except as a physical stain. But the age of Perikles, though, indeed, it produced a Nikias, was beginning to outgrow such notions, which at this time deserve the name of superstitions only. How great a hold, however, they still had on Sophokles' mind is tolerably clear from his Oidipus dramas. There can be no doubt but that the person of Oidipus inspired him with the same kind of unreasoning horror which it produced in his chorus. The poet is fully aware that Oidipus is morally innocent; and he would be unable to define the exact nature of the "miasma," or stain, in Oidipus' person. Nevertheless, because he is fully unprepared to think out the problem, he accepts the actual and effective existence of that "stain" even as he accepts the miracle that converted Oidipus from an evil-bringing power to a beneficial power; all this transcends human reason: that is why it is divine.

Another relic of earlier times is the sentiment, also prevalent among nearly all primitive peoples, which enjoins silence regarding certain matters and forbids the use of certain words. There is a reverential silence to be observed regarding things divine; "the identity or at least the close connection between a thing and its name not only makes the utterance of a holy name an invocation which ensures the actual presence of the deity invoked, it also makes the holy name too sacred for common use or even for use at all."\* Twice in Sophokles' extant plays Teiresias hesitates to divulge what the deity has made known to him, not only because he fears to offend his master, but the sacredness of his knowledge would

throne: *ὡς πλείστον εἰη τοῦδ' ἀποπτος ἄστεως* (O. T. 762). And Elektra, leaving Aigisthos to be buried by dogs and birds, yet takes care that his body shall be out of her and Orestes' sight: *ἀποπτον ἡμῶν* (El. 1489). Instructive are Kreon's words to the attendants who have suffered Oidipus to go forth from the palace: "if they have lost all reverence for man, at least let them revere the light of the sun: *τοῖόνδ' ἄγος ἀκάλυπτον δεικνύναι*. Cp. also O. K. 755 ff. and Oidipus' entreaty to hide him somewhere: *καλίσφαρ ἢ φονέσφαρ, ἢ θαλάσσιον ἐκρίφαρ, ἐνθα μέποι' εἰσάφεςθ' ἐτι* (O. T. 1411).

\* F. B. Jevons, "Introduction to the History of Religion," p. 361.

be disturbed by and does not bear to be set forth in simple and direct language.\* Similarly Oidipus can divulge only in vague terms what benefits he will bestow on Athens†, to Theseus alone he will confide "such mysteries which speech may not profane."‡ Again, Tekmessa only reluctantly relates what took place on that fateful morning of Aias' madness. How can she speak of which it not lawful to speak?§ For she has witnessed the work of some supernatural power, and, true to Greek sentiment, she fears lest a detailed account of all that happened might bring back the baleful influence of that dread power. A sharp distinction is made between things "rheta" and "arrheta,"—things of which it is lawful and of which it is unlawful to speak. Oidipus acknowledges that Teiresias cannot reveal all the god has given him knowledge of.|| Thus the messenger from Korinth asks whether it is lawful for him to know what the oracle said.¶

No one can fail to observe in what manner notions and sentiments like these were bound to affect people of Sophokles' stamp. The feeling that made man shrink from speaking of things holy and divine, or at least speak of these matters with bated breath; the firm belief that, when in the mysteries the deities were called upon by secret names, the mere utterance of such names by the votaries put them at once on a footing of intimacy with the god\*\*; the ideas associated with such terms as *εὐφημεῖν* and *δυσφημεῖν*,—all this must have tended to invest all things pertaining to the divine with a mysterious halo of its own. And innumerable are the things man dare

\* Teiresias says: ὄρσεις με τὰκίνητα διὰ φρενῶν φράσαι (*Ant.* 1060).

† ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ αὐδᾶν ἠδὲ τὰκίνητ' ἐπη (*O. K.* 624).

‡ ἃ δ' ἐξαγιστὰ μηδὲ κινεῖται λόγῳ (1526).

§ πῶς δῆτα λέγω λόγον ἀρρητον; (*Ai.* 214), not simply "a tale too dire for words" (Jebb).

|| Oidipus addresses the seer:

ὦ παντα νοῦν Τειρεσία, διδασκὰ τε  
ἀρρητὰ τ', οὐράνια τε καὶ χθονοστιβῆ. (*O. T.* 300)

¶ *O. T.* 993 ἢ ῥητὸν ἢ οἴχι θεμιτὸν ἄλλον εἶδεναι; cp. also 464 f., 1289. *O. K.* 978 ff., 1000 ff.

\*\* Gardner and Jevons, "Greek Antiquities," p. 224.

not know. For not only is the initiated forbidden to divulge his knowledge to the profane; not only does the god entrust his prophet with such knowledge as cannot be communicated to the masses; but often the gods themselves hide the truth from man, and in that case all human effort to pierce the darkness is vain and sinful.\*

Sophokles has no sympathy with those who carry their scrutinies into these forbidden domains†; their reckless conduct fills him with alarm.

Again, the Greek ritual, as practiced in Sophokles' day was a survival of a bygone age. The original meaning of most of these rites, often of elaborate character, had long been forgotten, yet they were carried out with strict observance of minute detail. The importance primitive man attached to this ritual, his fear that the omission of the slightest detail might render the whole ceremony fruitless or worse,—is a fact with which students of religion are familiar. In Sophokles' age the circumstance that in the large majority of cases time had obscured the original meaning of these rites, may have resulted in degrading them with many to a mere formalism devoid of all meaning. But this very circumstance, *viz.*, that origin and meaning of the ritual was no longer understood, tended only to increase its value for those filled with reverential wonder at the divine. In the performance of these rites they found the opportunity, instinctively sought for, of converting into act the ardor of their feelings.

The best illustration, apart from the *Antigone*, of Sophokles' attitude towards this ritual is furnished by the careful directions of the chorus in the *O. K.*, 466 ff., as to the means whereby Oidipus may appease the wrath of the dread goddesses on whose precinct he trespassed. In these particular rites, as in all others, the irrational element prevailed. Why was it dangerous to pour out wine to the Erinyes? Why

\* ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὰ θεῖα κρυπτόντων θεῶν, μάθοις ἄν, οὐδ' εἰ πάντ' ἐπεξέλθοις σκοπῶν (fr. 834) and cp. *O. T.* 280 f.

† μισῶ μὲν ὅστις τὰφανή περισκοπεῖ (fr. 667). μὴ πάντ' ἐρεῖνα· πόλλα καὶ λαθεῖν καλόν (fr. 81); and cp. *O. K.* 1640 ff.

should Oidipus take care to draw the water for his drink-offering from an ever-flowing spring? Why should he in the act of worship turn to the East? Why should he speak in cautious whispers? What mysterious danger was there in turning around after the performance of rites and prayers?

These are all "the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven; their life is not of to-day or yesterday, and no man knows when they were first put forth." All attempt to account for them on rational basis may prove futile; for that very reason they were of priceless value to those whose emotional temperament demanded expression of some kind.

To resume: we have seen there was much in Greek cult and religious sentiment apt to stimulate the sense of mystery, much that seemed to forbid man to reason with god. It was that element in Greek religion, that, belonging to an older stratum of belief, had been at the time of its origin reasonable enough to the primitive mind, but which now had become wholly unintelligible, or partly so. A bold thinker may partially succeed in freeing his mind from traditional bias. It was otherwise with him, who, at the mercy of his emotions, was naturally predisposed to wonder and awe.

But such an attitude towards the divine implies a fear of God, which is not the wholesome fear of the guilty conscience but an unreasoning dread at the Supernatural. In Sophokles it became the insuperable obstacle to his attaining to a nobler conception of God. For where his moral earnestness and his reverence for the Deity would and did cause him to look up to God as a Being, greater and better than himself, morally his superior, there, at another time, did his awe at the mystery, which seemed to enshroud the divine, forbid him to pry into what he conceives to be the secret motives of his god, to give utterance to doubts he may have felt and to reject what his reason would have told him to reject. If his gods are *not* unjust, *not* cruel, *not* malicious, it is only because he does not venture to measure their acts by the standards of human morality. He anxiously refrains from any utterance that



might even imply a lack of respect for the divine. When Elektra, in utter despair at the reported death of Orestes, is on the point of assailing the gods, the chorus hastily interpose their: "utter no rash cry!"\* For the gods are swift in punishing any utterance at which they may take offence. For a little boastful word Artemis exacts from Agamemnon the sacrifice of his daughter. Athena does not strike Aias with madness because of his evil designs against his countrymen, but in punishment of a few proud words, such as might have escaped the lips of any man, conscious of his strength. And when the cruel goddess lectures Odysseus and boastingly shows what the mighty Aias has become in her hands, the pious Odysseus does not ask himself: is this spitefulness, this cruelty worthy of a goddess? Nor can he exult in the downfall of his enemy. He is full of compassion and fear: "I think of mine own lot no less than his. For I see that we are but phantoms, all we who live, or fleeting shadows."† Expressions of this character occur with almost wearisome frequency in Sophokles' works. τὰ θνητὰ φρονεῖν, "to have mortal thoughts," that is the key-note of his attitude towards his god.

But this sense of human limitations was rapidly disappearing among his contemporaries. An awakening rationalism began to attack what it regarded as the superstitions of a by-gone age. It was a period of enlightenment, in which the spirit of free inquiry began to assert itself. Impatient of authority, it demanded a rational basis for all that formerly had been taken for granted. And worse than all to the pious Athenian: some representatives of the new wisdom did not stop at theorizing but on various occasions aggressively and with great display of profanity attacked the *form* of religion. This was a phase of the new enlightenment that was particularly offensive to the pietism of the Athenians.

\* *El.* 830: μηδὲν μέγ' αἰσας.

† *Ai.* 124: οὐδὲν τὸ τοῦτον μάλλον ἢ τοῖμὸν σκοπῶν.  
ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν  
εἰδωλ' ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν ἢ κόβην σκίαν.

How keenly Sophokles suffered under this condition of affairs we may still learn from that unique outburst found in the *O. T.*,—the most heart-felt and impassioned protest of genuine piety against the antagonistic tendencies of its time to be found in classical Greek literature. I mean the second stasimon of the *O. T.*

Sophokles begins by praying that in the midst of this ungodliness he may preserve his "purity" in words and deeds, regarding which there are laws of divine origin; never will these be lulled to sleep, for god lives in them (863-871). He prays in effect to his gods that they may not take away from him the awe with which he approaches all thing sacred; that he may not lose his reverence for the divine will, as announced in oracle and portent; that he may keep his mouth clean from any impious and blasphemous utterance; that they may leave him the joy of adoration when in the solemn act of worship. These "laws," then, are not to be identified with "the great moral laws." They are the prescription of conduct and speech regarding all matter holy and divine: the laws enjoining reverence for what traditionally had been regarded as sacred, and strict observance of the "*νόμῳ*," religious customs and usages. In short, they are the laws of reverence, but such laws, as must not act as a restraining power from without, but the obedience to which must proceed from the inwardly-felt needs of the heart; even as Antigone spontaneously performs the burial-rites and obeys the law of reverence because she cannot help obeying.

But this spirit of reverence is now sadly lacking in Athens. What generation after generation has held in sacred awe is now too often being ridiculed or contemptuously set aside. And these tendencies have just now culminated in a supreme act of wanton irreverence.\* He warns his people: "insolence breeds the tyrant." For why should he who pays no homage to the divine, have any reverence for the rights of man? Such wanton irreverence cannot last; in the end it

\* *ὕβρις*.

will meet its doom; it may glut itself with outrage after outrage: "when it hath scaled the topmost ramparts," it will be hurled down, held fast in the grip of a Greater Power, its limbs paralyzed. "But," the poet prays, "may there ever be in my city another group of men, ready to stand up for the rights of God." He will not cease looking up to the deity as his mainstay (872-881).

But he well knows that there are many who do not share this humble spirit of the devout. "Walking haughtily in word and deed," they prove their overweening self-reliance; in their ill-fated pride which does not fear the divine wrath, they have no veneration for the images of the gods; they lay their hands in what is holy, caring only for gain, regardless of "dike"; nothing can be too sacred not to be defiled by their touch. The poet declares in warning and most emphatic tones, that a community like theirs must be forever exposed to the divine wrath. It is true,—the semblance of religion is still there; nominally the gods are still worshipped with public rites. But with righteous indignation he denies that this mummerly or the cautious formalism of the hypocrite is a fair substitute for religion. For can one think of a greater indignity offered to God, than that of feigning reverence and joining in worship, when the hands are defiled by acts of sacrilege and the mouth by words of blasphemy (882-896)?

Then he turns to his god and with truly Greek *naïveté* threatening the deity to forsake him and his shrines, he calls on him to mete out exemplary punishment to those guilty of such wanton irreverence. He prays to the supreme god,—so grand and powerful that even the name Zeus cannot encompass his glory,—to that "King," the "all-ruling one," to his "ever-deathless power", to give this signal manifestation of his wrath, and to humble man's overweening pride. And it is high time; for oracles are set at nought, the divine will is no longer heeded; nowhere Apollo meets with the honor due to him; all reverence for the divine is perishing\* (897-910).

\* *ἵππευ δὲ τὰ θεῖα.*

Such is the everlasting protest of reverence against irreverence; of the mystic against the rationalist who would "dispute out of him the God whose presence he feels in his heart." The fiction of the Theban elders is entirely abandoned. All attempts to narrow down this ode to a mere commentary on the preceding scenes of the drama, are doomed to failure. Yet it is the same spirit that pervades both; or, rather, the sentiment in which the drama was conceived culminates in that ode. The ode we have called the protest of reverence against irreverence: the drama itself is but a powerful illustration of utter helplessness of man against god. The story of Oidipus, as told and interpreted by Sophokles would teach the spectator the lesson of humility.

Let us outline the tale of Oidipus in that unsophisticated form in which it probably appealed to our poet; and let us, for the time being, banish all thought of theodicy or moral order of the world or fatalism.

"Once upon a time there was a King of Thebes whose name was Laios. He dwelt in happiness and peace; when on a certain day god spoke to him and said: *Thou shalt have a son; and when he has grown to manhood, he will slay his father and marry his mother.* Laios was much concerned, lest the word of god should prevail; for he was a pious and god-fearing man. And when a child was born to him, he gave it to his herdsman, that he might expose it to the perils of the mountain-wilds and there let it perish.

"But the herdsman took pity on the child and gave it to another, who was pasturing the flocks of his master, the king of a neighboring country. This king took the child and reared it as his own since he was without offspring. And he named him Oidipus.

"But when the boy had grown to manhood, god spoke to him and said: *Thou shalt slay thy father and marry thy mother and have such offspring as man cannot endure to behold.* And Oidipus was much concerned lest the word of

god should prevail; for he was pious and god-fearing. And fleeing from his country, he set out to find a new home.

"And it came to pass that on his way he met another traveller, with whom he fell to quarrelling; and Oidipus slew him and his attendants.

"Not long hereafter he chanced to come to a city which was in dire distress. Its king had been killed and nearby, on a hill, there sat a terrible monster, with the face of a maiden and the body of winged lion. It chanted a riddle and certain death awaited all who failed to solve it.

"Wherefore the people, in sore need, proclaimed that he who should find the answer, should have a great reward in that he should be made their king and marry their queen.

"And, behold, Oidipus, the homeless wanderer, solved the riddle, whereupon the people made him their king and gave him their queen to wife.

"And Oidipus, thinking himself the child of good fortune, was grateful to the gods.

"The name of the city was Thebes. Many years he ruled in happiness and peace; for he was a just king and his wisdom was great. And four children he begot by his wife.

"But, at last, a great evil fell upon his people. There was a blight upon the fruits of the earth and on the increase of man and beast; and a terrible pestilence ravaged the town. The people in great despair turned to their king to rescue the state. But even his wisdom could find no means to relieve their suffering. But the god said *there was a defiling thing in Thebes which must be driven out.*

"And it was found that Oidipus himself, the wise and god-fearing ruler of his people, had caused their suffering and had polluted Thebes.

"For, behold, the word of god had come to pass."

Such I conceive to have been essentially the character and the form of that chapter of sacred history as it was present to Sophokles' mind. A tale of powerful simplicity, it made a direct appeal to his heart, and as such, purely as such, he set

himself to dramatize it with all the resources of his genius,—including “tragic irony.” The language in which he addresses his audience and by which he may have hoped to awaken them from their intellectual pride, is the language of reverence and wonder. He felt in the story of Oidipus the presence of that ineffable something, at which man can only marvel and bow his head in silent submission. And this he wished to bring home to his audience,—awakening in them the sense of mystery, which is not, indeed, religion itself, but the handmaid of religion; humbling their pride; shaking their confidence in that reason which was of so little avail to Oidipus. The Oidipus myth was preëminently adapted to Sophokles’ purpose: nowhere is the mystery of human suffering more appalling,—the story of a man whom the gods exalted to the highest pinnacle of human glory only to hurl him back to the deepest depth of human misery; a fit vehicle for the lesson the poet wished to impart: the lesson of humility.

In no other of the extant plays is the poet’s religious ardor so glowingly reflected as in the *O. T.* Here at last we see the genial Sophokles becoming conscious of a divine message he has to deliver, and rising almost to the dignity of religious prophetism. But it is idle to guess what event it was that had stirred him so profoundly as to rouse him to bitter denunciation of existing evils.

The drama, however, is nothing but an appeal to the religious and æsthetic emotions, and while Sophokles rises here to his greatest height, the same play exhibits more glaringly than any other the fatal defect of his religion. We have observed that modern interpreters have evolved more than one doctrine, including fatalism, from this play; and who shall deny that similar errors were committed by his contemporaries, in that age of subtle and acute arguing? It is all due to the fact that Sophokles gives absolutely no answer to the question that these interpreters have asked; his one-sided treatment of the story utterly fails to satisfy the demands of the intellect. Such treatment, again, is characteristic of the man himself;

he felt it deeply, but has not thought it out. His whole religious system,—if system it can be called,—is hopelessly superficial. And this accords well with the little we know of his personality: a man of sound physical constitution, of cheerful temperament, and of epicurean proclivities, a genial companion, easy-going and anxiously guarding the happy medium between the two extremes of the too-much and the too-little,—such is not the stuff religious prophets are made from. The moral grandeur of an Antigone and an Elektra to his mind is inseparable from harshness and intolerance; such bold assertion of right hardly fitted in with his ideas of human limitations.

But Sophokles' sermons on *sophrosyne* offered little consolation to those who stood in real need of such. He has no answer for those who vehemently cried for Light,—and such there lived also at his time. In stead of stimulating the thoughts of the spectator, Sophokles is content to mystify him; the atmosphere of the Sophoklean drama is altogether too oppressive for him who wants to breathe freely.

But that he never seriously and determinedly grappled with the great problems of life, is no doubt partly due to the kindness of fate, which vouchsafed him a long and happy life, rarely marred by any untoward event. All the more astounding is the error of those who find in him an approach to that higher and teleological view of suffering which is the choicest fruit of Christianity.

THE TEMPLE COLLEGE, PHILADELPHIA.



. IV.

MACCABEAN PSALMS.

REV. WM. G. SEIPLE, PH.D.

According to ancient Jewish and Christian tradition, the Psalter consists of psalms written by David. Modern critics, however, do not generally agree with this view. Critics, like Reuss, Kuenen and von Lengerke, assert that there is not a single Davidic psalm in the entire Psalter. Ewald admits seventeen psalms as Davidic, Hitzig fourteen, Delitzsch forty-four, Schultz ten, and Baethgen three (3, 4, 18), with some hesitation. Driver in his *Introduction* (8th ed., New York, 1898), p. 380, says: "On the whole, a *non liquet* must be our verdict: it is possible that Ewald's list of Davidic Psalms is too large, but it is not clear that none of the Psalms contained in it are of David's composition." W. Robertson Smith in *OTJC*<sup>2</sup> (1895), p. 223, thinks that "there is no Psalm which we can assign to him [David] with absolute certainty and use to throw light on his character or any special event in his life." Cheyne, in the article on "David," *EB*, 1035, concurs in this view. According to Professor Paul Haupt, there are no Psalms of David.\*

After a lengthy discussion of the question of non-Davidic or Davidic psalms in the Psalter, commentators began to consider the question of pre-Exilic or post-Exilic psalms. Driver in his *Introduction*, pp. 384 ff., thinks that the royal psalms (2, 18, 20, 21, 28, 45, 61, 63, 72) and a few others, notably 46, 76, 89-91, 101 and 110, may be pre-Exilic, but that very few of the Psalms are earlier than the seventh century B. C. Rev. J. P. Peters, D.D., believes that perhaps the greater part

\* Cf. his paper "David's Dirge on Saul and Jonathan," in *JHUC*, Vol. XXII., No. 163 (June, 1903), pp. 53-57.

of Book I. of the Psalter is pre-Exilic.\* Kirkpatrick in his commentary on the Psalms (Cambridge Bible Series, 1893-1895) considers the royal psalms and also 46, 48, 75 and 76 pre-Exilic. Kautzsch thinks that "our present Psalter contains a fair number of pre-Exilic songs or fragments of songs."† Baethgen makes about thirty or forty psalms pre-Exilic and refers them to the period of the Israelitish kingdom. All the rest he considers either Exilic or post-Exilic.‡

Duhm and Cheyne have entirely rejected the critical hypothesis of pre-Exilic psalms. According to Duhm, who refers most of the psalms to the Maccabean or post-Maccabean period, the oldest is 137, which he considers an adaptation of a popular song, written during the Exile. Wellhausen's dictum:§ "The question is not whether the Psalter contains post-Exilic, but whether it contains any pre-Exilic Psalms," has in turn been superseded by the problem of the present day, whether the Psalter contains any pre-Maccabean psalms. Professor Haupt believes that there are undoubtedly three Maccabean psalms, but has not discovered any pre-Exilic psalms. ||

J. B. Peters, Francis Brown and H. Zimmern¶ have shown that there is often a remarkable identity of technical phraseology and religious ideas as well as of metrical form between the Babylonian and the Hebrew penitential psalms. The

\* Cf. his article on "The Development of the Psalter," *New World*, Vol. II., 6 (June, 1893), p. 303 f.

† Cf. E. Kautzsch, "An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Testament" (Translated by John Taylor), London, 1898, p. 143.

‡ Cf. F. Baethgen, "Die Psalmen" (2d ed., Goettingen, 1897), p. xxiii.

§ Cf. F. Bleek's, "Einleitung in das Alte Testament" (4th ed., by J. Wellhausen, Berlin, 1878), p. 507, and J. Wellhausen, *SBOT* Psalms (English), p. 163, ll. 10-14.

|| Cf. his article cited above, p. 1, n. \*.

¶ Cf. Peters' article cited above p. 1, n. †; F. Brown, "The Religious Poetry of Babylonia," *Presbyterian Review*, Vol. IX., No. 33 (Jan., 1888), pp. 69-86; and H. Zimmern in *KAT* (1903), pp. 607-612, also Hehn, "Suende und Erloesung nach bibl. und babyl. Anschauung" (1903); Caspari, "Die Religion der assyr.-babl. Busspsalmen" (Guetersloh, 1903); A. Jeremias, "Monotheistische Stroemungen innerhalb der babyl. Religion" (Leipzig, 1904).

terms for "sin" (Assyr. *hiṭtu* and *hiṭitu*, Heb. *ḥattā'ah* and *ḥōṭā'ah*) and "grace" (Assyr. *annu*, Heb. *hēn*) and other ideas either correspond closely or are identical. In the Babylonian psalms we have the same parallelism of members, which is so characteristic of Hebrew poetry. It is not at all improbable that, during the Exile in Babylonia, the Jews became familiar with the penitential psalms of their conquerors, and that these may have served as models for the hymns in the Hebrew Psalter, just as Professor Haupt has shown, that the Levitic ritual was influenced by Babylonian institutions.\*

Quite recently, however, critics have assigned most of the Psalms to the Maccabean period. Olshausen did this over fifty years ago in his commentary on the Psalms (Leipzig, 1853). The great Syrian theologian and Biblical scholar, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, more than 1,500 years ago, called attention to the existence of Maccabean psalms, but it was done in a rather guarded manner. He made David the author of all the Psalms, but said that David, in the spirit of prophecy, had predicted the future destinies of his people. Seventeen psalms (44, 47, 55-60, 62, 69, 74, 79, 80, 83, 108, 109, and 144) were assigned by him to the Maccabean period. He could not regard the superscriptions of the Psalms, either in the Hebrew or the LXX, as original and authoritative, a view that is now generally recognized.† Theodoret and Chrysostom referred a few psalms to this period. During the Reformation period, Esrom Rudinger, the former colleague of Melancthon, assigned twenty-five psalms definitely to the Maccabean period, leaving it an open question with two, viz., 26 and 28.‡ Venema in his commentary on the Psalms

\* Cf. his paper on "Babylonian Elements in the Levitic Ritual," *JBL*, XIX. (1900), pp. 55-81.

† Cf. T. K. Cheyne, "Early Criticism of the Psalter in Connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia," *Thinker* (June, 1893), pp. 496-498, and F. Baethgen, "Siebzehn makkabaeische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia," *ZAT*, 1886, pp. 261-288; 1887, pp. 1-60.

‡ Cf. C. Ehrst, "Abfassungszeit u. Abschluss des Psalters zur Pruefung der Frage nach Makkabaeerpsalmen" (Leipzig, 1869), p. 3 f.

(Loeuardiae, 1762-1767) considered thirty-four psalms Maccabean. Vitranga made five (74, 75, 79, 80, 89) Maccabean, Berthold (1812) eight (44, 69, 74, 79, 115, 118, 119, 149), Paulus (1815) five (66, 74, 79, 115, 123), and Hesse (1837) seven (44, 60, 74, 79, 83, 94, 118). Hitzig assigned all of the Psalms from 73 onward, except 82, 84, 85, and 87, to the Maccabean period, 1, 2, and 60 to Alexander Jannaeus, and 42-44 and 65 to Onias III.\*

Reuss, in the second edition of his "*Geschichte der Heiligen Schrift des Alten Testaments*" (Braunschweig, 1890), p. 630, mentions forty-one psalms as Maccabean. Graetz in his commentary (1882-1883) makes twelve Maccabean, three post-Maccabean (134-136) and five pre-Maccabean but Greek (1, 119, 140, 141, 145). Cheyne, in his "*Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*" (1891), p. 455 f., regards twenty-six psalms as Maccabean and sixteen as pre-Maccabean Greek psalms, among them Ps. 72. W. Robertson Smith considered Ps. 33 a possible addition by the final collector and assigned the collection of Psalms 90-150, as well as the completion of the Psalter, to the early Maccabean period.† Driver in his "*Introduction*," p. 387 f., says: "It is true, our knowledge of the circumstances under which either the Psalter was compiled, or the Canon of the OT was completed does not entitle us to deny peremptorily the presence of Maccabean psalms in the collection; and if it be the fact that Pss. 44, 74, 79 were introduced into the Psalter in (or after) this period, it is difficult to argue that other psalms may not have been introduced into it likewise. But there is no sufficient reason for supposing this to have been the case on the scale supposed by Olshausen and Reuss. Had so many Psalms dated from this age, it is difficult not to think that they would have borne more prominent marks of it in their diction and style." Kautzsch thinks that Psalms 44, 74, and 83 are very probably isolated Maccabean psalms in the second collection (42-89)

\* Cf. F. Hitzig, "*Die Psalmen*," Leipzig, 1863.

† Cf. *OTJC* (1895)², pp. 212 and 438.

and that there are also a large number of Maccabean psalms in the third collection (90-150).<sup>\*</sup> Kessler<sup>†</sup> is of the opinion that neither the majority nor even a considerable number of Psalms are a product of the Maccabean period, but admits that a few psalms may have been appended to the Psalter during this period, as *e. g.*, Ps. 149. Professor Toy in *JBL* (June, 1887), pp. 47-60, assigns Psalms, 2, 18, 21, 44, 45, and 79 to the Hasmonean or Maccabean period. Baethgen ascribes Psalms 44, 74, 79, and 83 with certainty to the Maccabean period. For Psalms 2, 110, 69, 149, he considers this time the most probable, and for Psalms 75, 102, 108 and 144 at any rate possible.<sup>‡</sup> Professor Haupt assigns the majority of the psalms to the Maccabean period (about 170-70 B. C.), among them Pss. 1, 2, 16, 23, 45, 83, and 118. §

While Koenig in his "Einleitung," p. 403, can only see his way clear to recognize one Maccabean psalm, *viz.*, 74, a great many critics regard at least Psalms 44, 74, 79, and 83 as Maccabean. So notably Baethgen, Kautzsch, Cornill "Einleitung," (pp. 219, 314) and Schuerer. || C. H. H. Wright in his "Introduction" (London, 1891), p. 157, thinks these four psalms may be Maccabean, but is doubtful. Harlan Creelman in an article "Are There Maccabean Psalms?" in the "Old and New Testament Student (Biblical World)," Vol. 15 (1892), pp. 94-104 and 192-201, advances the view that Psalms 44, 74, 79, and 83 were written at an earlier period (74 and 79 perhaps at the time of the Chaldean invasion) and afterwards in the Maccabean struggle "worked over and given a fresh setting with new expressions and references in harmony with the condition of affairs at this later period."<sup>¶</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Cf. p. 146 of work cited above on p. 1, n. †.

<sup>†</sup> Cf. H. Kessler, "Die Psalmen" (2d ed., Muenchen, 1890), p. xvii.

<sup>‡</sup> Cf. F. Baethgen, "Die Psalmen" (2d ed., Goettingen, 1897), p. xxix.

<sup>§</sup> Cf. *AJSL*, XIX., 3, pp. 130 and 135, n. 11; *JHUC*, Vol. XXII., No. 163 (June, 1903), p. 90; *AJSL*, XX., p. 170, n. 55 and n. 60; and *ZDMG*, 85, p. 629, n. 22.

|| Cf. E. Schuerer, "Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi" (3d ed., Leipzig, 1902), Vol. III., pp. 148-149.

<sup>¶</sup> For a similar view as to the origin of Pss. 74, 79 and 83, cf. J. P. Peters, *New World*, Vol. II., 6 (June, 1893), p. 304 n.

Rudinger (1580), Venema (1762), Bengel, von Lengerke, de Jong, Steiner, Perowne, Muehlmann, and Franz Delitzsch regarded Pss. 44, 74, and 79 as Maccabean, van der Palm and Kuenen 44, 79, and 83. Giesebrecht\* and Driver consider 74, 79, and 83 Maccabean. Noeldeke in his "Alttestamentliche Litteratur" (Leipzig, 1868), pp. 132-133, assigns 44, 74, and 83 to this period. Calvin and the translators of the Geneva Bible regarded 44 and 74 as Maccabean, while Vitringa and J. H. Michaelis referred 74 and 79, Rosenmueller 44 and 79, and C. L. W. Grimm 79 and 83 to the same period. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Nicolaus de Lyra, Dathe, van Hengel, and de Wette made Ps. 44 Maccabean, Theodoret and Eusebius Ps. 79, and Diodorus of Antioch (c. 380 A. D.) and Solomon van Til (1690) Ps. 83. Dillmann considers this psalm, together with 60 and 80 post-Exilic, but admits that a Maccabean date for them is very plausible.

Rosenmueller and de Wette† were at first inclined to favor the existence of Maccabean psalms, but retracted their views in later editions of their works.

The existence of Maccabean psalms has been strongly denied and contested by Gesenius ("Allgemeine Halle'schen Litteraturzeitung," No. 81, p. 643 ff.), Hassler, Haevernick, Ewald,‡ Boettcher, Thenius, de Wette, Keil, Hengstenberg, Dillmann, Hupfeld, Bleek, and Ehrt ("Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters," Leipzig, 1869).

The admitted presence of Maccabean psalms in the Psalter argues a late date for its final redaction and publication. W. Robertson Smith in his *OTJC* § (1895), p. 212, assigned the completion of the Psalter to "the early years of Maccabee sovereignty." Henry Preserved Smith, in his "Old Testament

\* Cf. F. Giesebrecht, *ZAT*, 1881, p. 304.

† Cf. Rosenmueller's "Scholien" (1821) and de Wette's "Commentar ueber die Psalmen" (5th ed. by Gustav Baur, Heidelberg, 1856), p. 10.

‡ Cf. H. Ewald, "Ueber das suchen und finden sogenannter Makabaeischer Psalmen," *Jahrbecher der biblischen Wissenschaften*, Goettingen, 1853-1854, pp. 20-32.

§ Cf. B. Duhm, "Die Psalmen" (Freiburg i. B., 1899), p. xii.

History" (New York, 1903), p. 471, ascribes the final redaction and publication of the Book of Psalms to the reign of Simon (142 B. C.). Ryle in his "Canon of the Old Testament," p. 127, says: "The time of its final promulgation in its present form and of its first recognition as part of the people's Scriptures, may well have been that of the great religious revival that accompanied the success of the Maccabean revolt, and the downfall of the Hellenizing party among the priests and nobles." Duhm thinks the Psalter was probably completed about 70 B. C. under Queen Alexandra, or Salome. Professor Haupt in his article on "The Prototype of the Magnificat," ZDMG 85 (1904), p. 629, n. 22, also places the date of the final redaction of the Psalter in the reign of Queen Salma Alexandria (76-67 B. C.) and considers Ps. 2 a poem celebrating the coronation of Aristobulus, her first husband, as King of the Jews (104 B. C.), which was prefixed to the Psalter out of deference to the Queen. The first psalm he makes a subsequent Pharisean addition, probably prefixed to Ps. 2, which was originally the first psalm according to Acts 13, 33, after 100 A. D., though it may have been written 153 B. C.

SENDAI, JAPAN.

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

- OTJC. W. Robertson Smith's *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. 2d ed., London, 1895.
- EB. *Encyclopædia Biblica* (quoted by the column).
- JHUC. Johns Hopkins University Circulars.
- SBOT. *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (Polychrome Bible), edited by Professor Paul Haupt.
- KAT. Zimmern and Winckler's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. 3d ed., Berlin, 1903.
- JBL. *Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*.
- ZAT. *Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft*.
- AJSL. *American Journal of Semitic Languages*.
- ZDMG. *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft*.



V.

FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON AS A SPIRITUAL  
GENIUS.

THE REV. HENRY H. RANCK.

The study of history always centers in the great men who embody in themselves the thought and movement of their time. This is especially true of religious teachers and leaders who *are* what they say and do. Frederick W. Robertson, an independent thinker with remarkable insight into things human and divine, may justly be looked upon as a spiritual genius—a truly great man. "Great men exist," says Emerson, "that there may be greater men." Without doubt Robertson has helped the attainment of that end. Harnack reminds us, "the value of a truly great man consists in his increasing the value of all mankind." This may be said of Robertson, because it applies preëminently to our Lord Jesus Christ whom Robertson followed with passionate devotion and interpreted with marvelous clearness. He lived only to the age of thirty-seven, and his permanent work was done during the last seven years of his life, yet he has left us a body of sermons and addresses, unequalled in their helpfulness to understanding the life of Jesus and in unraveling the subtleties of the human heart. He drew men in crowds to his church, especially such as were of a sceptical turn, and showed to them the sunny reasonableness of the gospel. Many a man was saved through him from Unitarianism and infidelity. His influence was great even in life, but far greater after his death through his published sermons. He was a prophet in his own generation and for that reason is a living voice for all time.

He was born in London, February 3, 1816, studied at Tours, France, at the Edinburg Academy and then in Brazenose College, Oxford, where his preparation for the ministry was

completed. He was ordained in 1840, served as curate for a year in Winchester, and for five years at Cheltenham. He became the incumbent of St. Ebbes, Oxford in 1847, remaining but a few months, after which he went to Trinity Church, Brighton where he died August 15th, 1853.

To appreciate the life and work of Robertson, we need to bear in mind the political and religious condition of England in his day. The Reform Bill was passed in 1832. William IV. died in 1837 and with him passed the reign of personal government in England. Queen Victoria succeeded. Constitutional government really became a fact, and larger liberties and rights were given to the people, not, however, without the vigorous opposition of the privileged classes. The rationalism of Germany had penetrated English thought. Science was supposed to be taking away the foundations of belief. The established church was losing her prestige and her influence was felt to be on the wane. To counteract these tendencies, to instill new life into the church, and to secure again for her a commanding authority, the Oxford movement, better known as Tractarianism, was launched the year after the Reform Bill, by John Keble's assize sermon at the University on the existing perils of the Church.

"Liberalism" was the enemy these Oxford leaders, Newman, Froude and Pusey, with unquestioned sincerity and moral earnestness, proposed to meet and overthrow, resolved as they were to maintain inviolate the doctrines, the services and the discipline of the church, "and the primitive practice in religious offices." Tractarianism regarded the sacraments as the expressly authorized means of partaking of the life of Christ, made much of tradition, seeking authority in the undivided church prior to the schism between the East and West, insisted on Apostolical succession, taught baptismal regeneration; and thus was essentially a revival of mediaevalism, with but little sympathy for the Reformation movement and with increasing drift towards the Roman Church, as future decades more abundantly showed. In direct antagonism to the Trac-

tarian school was the low church party in the Anglican Church—the Evangelical school. They with equal vigor decried the sceptical liberalism in thought, and set the Bible over against tradition as the sole authority. They were active in many practical endeavors and in the performing of good works, but did little toward the theological reconstruction which the times so much demanded.

A movement of a very different character from Tractarianism, yet springing out of essentially the same prevailing conditions, especially touching the relation of church and state, was that in Scotland, issuing in the memorable secession from the Scotch establishment of 470 ministers on May 18, 1843, and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Free Church of Scotland under the leadership of Thomas Chalmers.

These were the stirring times in which Robertson was reared. In his youth as well as in his maturer years he took the deepest interest in the current political and religious questions and studied them diligently and thoroughly, so that he was able to make a substantial contribution to their solution. In his student days and earlier ministry, he was a devoted adherent and partisan of the Evangelical school. He practiced its most rigid precepts with vigor, sounded its depths in his own experience, weighed it in the balance and found it wanting, became disgusted with its shallowness, its cant and its sentimentality, and then with anguishing birth-throes came into the larger liberty of the gospel, in which he so powerfully wrought at Brighton. He was far removed from the Tractarians, yet he could not fail to feel their earnestness. He belonged to no party, yet he is generally classed with the Broad Churchmen, finding many points of contact with Richard Whately and Thomas Arnold and being in large sympathy with F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley. With them he lent a hand to much needed reconstruction, gave voice to the broader outlook and the larger hope, and did much to harmonize science and revelation.

Men of genius—poets, orators, artists—are said to be born,

not made. Others again define genius as a capacity for hard work—opposite statements, but not contradictory. The truth is found in the two taken together. This illustrates one of the principles of Robertson's teaching: "that truth is made up of two opposite propositions and not found in a *via media* between the two," a principle which he applies to his own life and particularly to the choice of his profession, in the terms of fate and freedom. "All is free," he says, "that is false," "All is fate, that is false," "All things are free and fated—that is true." When we come to look into Robertson's constitutional make-up, we see at once a mind and heart of rare endowments, a choice spirit which already in youth was prophetic of great things. He had the advantage moreover of most favorable surroundings in childhood and youth, used well his opportunities and brought into all his life and work the discipline of an iron will. When he was five years old, his father, Captain Robertson retired from the Army on half pay, in order to attend to the education of his children, of whom Frederick was the eldest. For four years he enjoyed the personal instruction and care of his father and mother who kept him from even the slightest touch of evil influences. The influence of his home and parental training followed him through life and he always recognized the debt he owed them. The books, which were wisely selected for him, and which he read with avidity, enriched his open and docile mind. In the seclusion of his home he cultivated the habit of meditation and thinking which were enlivened by a strong imagination. Yet he was neither morbid nor unnatural, but a buoyant boy, enjoying life, and delighting in the open air, sunshine, and vigorous exercise. His education, so wisely and auspiciously begun, was continued in the same tenor at the schools and throughout his life. Robertson had a sensitive, sympathetic, imaginative nature; with this was combined an exceptional dialectic power which would never rest until it had laid hold of the principle by which all things must be ordered in proper relations—an unusual combination in a man, because the one nearly always

flourishes to the neglect of the other. In addition to these qualities he had a strong will, with which he mastered the dangerously erratic elements of his nature, thus bringing the whole man into a poise of power.

"The root of all that was peculiar in Robertson's character," says his biographer, "lay in the intense sensitiveness which pervaded his whole nature." His senses, his passions, his imagination, his conscience, his spirit were so delicately wrought that they thrilled and vibrated to the slightest touch. A light day stirred his spirit, and he could work; a gloomy day hung over him like a pall. Beauty of scenery was a great delight. A landscape, a sunset, an alpine peak stirred his soul to ecstasy. The effect of art was similar. Hence his appreciation of poetry as the interpretation of nature which he unconsciously moralized, as its beauties registered their impression on his soul. He made no effort to retain these impressions of nature and art and "hook them to some useful end." They remained, and when he spoke or wrote, they came trooping unbidden to his service for illustration and illumination. His wide sympathy with man and the world was the key to his power. He seemed able to read every man's soul, put himself in his place, and feel for the time being what he felt. Thus he could be of help to men, because he understood them and their trials better than they themselves did.

He likewise craved sympathy, was easily jarred, and would sit silent for a whole evening if he felt himself suspected. On the other hand, he responded instantly to those who were akin to him, and would speak for hours most lucidly on difficult subjects, if he felt himself helpful and appreciated. He said his misfortune or happiness was power of sympathy—"I can feel with the Brahmin, the Pantheist, the Stoic, the Platonist, the Transcendentalist, perhaps the Epicureans, \* \* \* the side of Utilitarianism which seems like truth, though I have more antipathy to that than anything else. I can suffer with the Tractarian; \* \* \* I can agonize with the infidels, recoiling from the cowardice and false rest of superstition. Many

men can feel each of these separately and they are happy. They go on straight forward, like a one-eyed horse seeing all clear on one side; but I feel them all at once." This many-sidedness caused him to be much misunderstood, yet it was a source of power. He appreciated the true and good wherever he saw it, however much it was mixed with the ugly and the evil. His spirit, chaste in youth, was never stained in life. Without doubt this purity of heart was the secret to which he owed his keen insight into truth and his power of solving spiritual problems. His messages came like a revelation from heaven to those who heard them, and yet were simple and clear as day. "There are three things," he said, "which deserve no quarter in this world, hypocrisy, phariseism, tyranny." His indignation at falsehood, injustice, impurity, was overpowering. His method of dealing with evils was positive and constructive, yet he could denounce crime, and then his words fell with the awfulness of a judicial sentence.

He was, however, like Christ, considerate of human weakness and most tolerant of the views of others. He associated with all men, and tried to do them good. He drew to himself all men,—the wealthy aristocrat and the poor laborer. He sympathized deeply with the classes who had little opportunity, organized the workingmen's institute in Brighton and delivered notable lectures to its members on poetry and social questions. His tastes were with the aristocrat, his sympathies with the mob. Because he would not be a partisan favoring the laboring men, many of them lost confidence in him, and denounced him. Nor did he please the privileged classes. He resolved difficulties, however, by teaching the higher and more comprehensive truth. He never joined a party. He believed high ends could be attained only by being the free servant of truth and following where she led. He did not rest comfortably with an isolated thought; it had to be coördinated with his system of truth. But all his thinking was directed to human ends. The true and beautiful were studied in their relation to living men; thus his ideas became real and practical. He

turned emotion and thought into conduct. He believed that a stirring of emotion which did not issue in action was injurious to character; therefore, he judged men by their character and life rather than by their creed.

His tolerance toward others did not free him from their abuse, however, because, belonging to no party, he was assailed by all, and was without that support of friends which partisanship gives. He stood alone—therefore he could give his matchless interpretation of "The Loneliness of Christ." All this took courage, which was a marked feature of his character. This was shown in the daring, even reckless exploits of his boyhood and in his predilection for a military career, for which throughout life he had a passionate liking. He said he would rather lead a forlorn hope than mount the pulpit stairs. The sight of drilling soldiers gave him a choking sensation from the thrilling emotion which he could not suppress. He was fearful lest he might prove a coward. A military career was his choice, not for laurels, but to do good. He did not want to enter the ministry of the church, and did so only after having waited long, and, as he thought, hopelessly for a commission in the army. It came a fortnight after his matriculation at Oxford. His chivalrous spirit had a romantic instinct of self-sacrifice which was with him in all that he did. His fitness for the ministry led many to suggest it to him in youth, but his reply was, "No never," and again, "I'm not fit for it." This humility, this sense of personal unworthiness, was characteristic. It came out in the undervaluing of his own work, his belief that he was accomplishing nothing. This appears especially in his letters written often in moods of depression. A kindred peculiarity was his morbid scrupulosity of conscience. He shrank as a youth with the purism of a boy from mispronunciations. The slightest deviation from truthfulness was abhorrent to him. His mother said of him, "I never knew him to tell a lie."

He was conscious of his over-sensitiveness, realized keenly the weaknesses of his character, and resolutely set himself to



correct them through brisk physical exercise, the soothing influences of poetry, and the study of science. He had his temptations and doubts. He strove to overcome and solve them by an extensive work of benevolence among the poor. He showed nevertheless, considering his sensitive nature, a marvelous common sense throughout. Lithe of figure, handsome, with a melodious voice, he was an attractive speaker. He preached with few notes with an elegance of language, a compactness of thought, with a power of analysis, penetration and yet clearness which are rarely found. He suffered excruciating nervous depression after preaching. He lived and wrought with consuming intensity. *What* he accomplished was enough for a long life and its quality was unique.

Robertson enumerates six principles which guided him in his teaching:

1. "The establishment of positive truth, instead of the negative destruction of error." This was the basis of his controversial teaching, especially in dealing with the Roman dogmas which so much troubled the minds of Christians in his day.

2. "That truth is made up of two opposite propositions"—noted above in the case of fate and freedom.

3. "That spiritual truth is discerned by the spirit, instead of intellectually in propositions." Thus his teaching was suggestive, not dogmatic, and therein he marks a transition to a period in which religion is treated less as a series of propositions, more as all-pervading life.

4. "The belief in the human character of Christ's humanity, must be antecedent to belief in his divine origin." During his life his opponents said he had no fixed system of teaching. The molding principle of his thinking was the divine human Christ, whose divinity was authenticated by his perfect humanity.

5. "That Christianity, as its teachers should, works from the inward to the outward and not vice versa." This principle is everywhere manifest in his teaching.

6. "The soul of goodness in things evil."

What now was accomplished by Robertson? Spiritual results are too subtle to be measured and counted, but we can indicate some of the directions of his influence:

1. Upon those who came in touch with him and heard him—his congregation, and the working men amongst whom he labored. In striving for the uplifting of the workingmen, his efforts were the most successful of those made in his day.

2. His influence after death through his writings. His sermons have a perennial freshness, dealing with eternal principles, telling the old story of sin and grace which is ever new. They appeared very soon in many editions, and continue in great favor to the present.

3. As a preacemaker, thinks his biographer, he did the great work of his life. All thoughtful men, however divided in opinion, find in his writings a point of contact and thus are led to stand more closely together on the truth of Christ.

4. Toward science his attitude was friendly. "Modern Science," he exclaims, "is eminently Christian," not boldly theorizing as of old, but patiently seeking to be taught by the facts of nature, and performing its wonders by exact imitation of them, on the true principle that the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do. The historical method and the idea of development are clearly recognized by him.

5. Toward the Bible he showed profound reverence, but deprecated bibliolatry. He insisted even in his student days on an accurate and critical study of it, to find out what it really teaches. His view of inspiration was such that he saw the necessity of scientific inaccuracies therein, else it would have been unintelligible to those for whom it was written.

6. He led men to think for themselves, and to follow the lead of divine guidance, not seeking external infallible authority. Within the necessary limits a man should follow out his own character, and not submit to the common mould. This is the freedom which Christ gives, and which makes the real man.

Robertson did not regard his teaching as final or entirely free from error and defect. He believed it would be superseded by larger knowledge and deeper insight. He lived beyond his own time and suffered for it, but he has an abiding glory in helping to the light many an earnest, struggling soul.

READING, PA.

## VI.

### FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF MINISTERS.

A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

There are a few things to which it seems to us the attention of the ministry of our church ought to be called, and in our opinion they are of sufficient importance to be discussed in the columns of the *REVIEW*.

In the first place there are indications that the significance and importance of the Church Judicatories are not realized as ought to be the case. In our church we have the Consistory, the Classis, the District Synod and the General Synod. This is the order of their existence and also of their relative importance. They are official bodies. The Consistory is composed of the pastor and the acting elders and deacons of the congregation. The other bodies are made up exclusively of ministers and elders. The members of all these judicatories are ordained officers of the church; hence they do not constitute ordinary assemblages. Office in the church carries with it special significance and force, and the higher the office the greater its importance and value. Consequently the people are challenged to show respect unto those who fill the offices of the church. They ought to be esteemed "very highly for their work's sake." Hence too the exhortation, "obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves." When these officers meet for the transaction of business pertaining to the Kingdom of God, the body which they compose ought to command the respect and obedience of the people.

The congregation ought to look upon the Consistory as a body representing the interests of the Church, and its decisions and instructions ought to be regarded as coming to the people with official authority. The Classis as a higher body, being constituted of ministers and elders and comprehending in its

jurisdiction a large number of congregations ought to be considered as carrying with it corresponding importance and value to the Church. The Synod stands still higher as it is a more comprehensive body and covers a larger scope of ecclesiastical affairs. The General Synod representing the whole church and exercising the supreme functions of a church court ought to be regarded of highest significance and greatest value to the Church. The Church judicatories, from the lowest to the highest, have an important meaning and value attached to them and ought to be respected and obeyed in the Lord by ministers, officers and people. It seems to us to be the solemn duty of ministers to emphasize by precept and example the importance of these official bodies of the Church. The Apostle said "I magnify mine office." So ministers ought to magnify their office, and church judicatories ought to magnify the functions which they are called upon to perform in the Kingdom of God.

It is the plain duty of elders and deacons to attend the meetings of the Consistory and to discharge the duties devolving upon them as members of that body. Every pastor is ready to affirm this position. In like manner it is the duty of the pastor and delegate elders to attend the meetings of Classis and Synod. And this means that they be present from the opening to the close of these meetings. If they have a proper appreciation of the ecclesiastical significance of these judicatories they will realize that their presence at these meetings is demanded of them. Every minister ought to be present at the sessions of Synod, for his own sake, for the sake of the body, and for the sake of the Church. We have in mind a Synod that meets in general convention, as every Synod in our church ought to do. And we rejoice in the fact that the sentiment is growing in favor of reducing the size of our District Synods so that they will be able to meet in general convention. Every minister ought to attend the meeting of his Synod. He will gain inspiration from its services and proceedings, become interested in the general work of the Church, gain a

knowledge of the opinions and feelings and practices of his fellow ministers, and, as a consequence become more efficient in his own field than he otherwise would be. A full attendance on the part of ministers and elders upon the sessions of Synod make the body more imposing, gives inspiration to the speakers, makes the consideration of the subjects discussed more thorough and gives efficiency to its transactions and decisions. And the portion of the Church comprehended in the Synod will be the more benefited because all the ministers and elders will carry the enthusiasm of the body to their congregations and move them to larger efforts and greater zeal. It is a loss to the pastor, a loss to the Synod, and a loss to the congregation for him to absent himself from all or part of the annual sessions of Synod.

The Synod to which it has been our pleasure and profit to belong during our entire ministry has always met in general convention and has all along been fairly well attended especially by the ministry. A tendency, however, has been manifesting itself for some years past on the part of some pastors to absent themselves from some sessions of Synod and from the services of the Lord's Day. Ministers serving charges from ten to fifty miles distant from the place of the Synodical meeting have been making appointments in their own churches for Synod Sunday and returning home to meet their appointment, usually taking some other ministers along to do the preaching for them. At the last meeting of this Synod about ten pastors did so. We regard this practice as a serious mistake. The argument offered in its favor is that an abundance of ministers remain to conduct the religious services of Synod, and that the benefit which the congregations derive from the services conducted by the returning ministers is so much gain. This is a plausible argument, but in our opinion there are other considerations of sufficient weight to set it entirely aside. Those ministers lose the benefit of the Synodical services of the Lord's Day and the Synod loses the benefit of their presence. The meeting of Synod ought to make a favorable im-

pression upon the people of the town in which it is held both for the benefit of the local congregation and for that of the Church at large in whose interest the Synod has assembled. This can be done fully only by the presence of all the members of the body. Further, the pastor who thus habitually absents himself from a portion of the Synodical sessions loses his influence in the body. The Synod unconsciously comes to feel that such a minister does not care for it, and it in turn will then not care for him. He will not have the standing in the body while he would have if he regarded it of sufficient importance to close his church on the Sunday on which it is in session and give it the benefit of his presence. If anyone wishes to enjoy the respect of the body to which he belongs he must show his respect for it. This is a law which cannot be violated with impunity. But more than all this: pastors who hold services in their churches on the Synodical Sunday at a distance from the Synod's place of meeting thereby wrong their own people. Instead of being a benefit, it is an injury to them. It has a tendency to destroy their appreciation of the importance and value of the Synod. By example it teaches them to regard a service in their congregation of more account than the services of this judicatory of the Church. What the people need is a high appreciation of the spiritual and ecclesiastical value of the Synod. They ought to be made to feel the significance of the Synod in the government and guidance and support of all the affairs of the Church. They ought to cherish a proper respect for the judgment and decisions of the Synod. But when the pastor returns on the Synodical Sunday with another minister with him he shows to his people the low estimate which he places upon that body. But if he annually announces to his people that Synod will be in session and consequently there will be no services in their church the following Sunday he teaches them that the meeting of Synod is of importance. The value of the Synod to the Church and to the Kingdom of God is thus magnified and the pastor will be able much more easily and efficiently to carry out the requests and



directions and actions of Synod in his labors during the year. It pays the pastor to attend the sessions of Synod from the beginning to end including the services of the Lord's Day. It pays the congregation for him to do so. And no Consistory ought to request the pastor to return from Synod to conduct services in his own church. We do not mean to object to the filling of the pulpits in the town or city where the Synod is held and in Churches in close proximity to the place, but our argument is meant to hold against going ten or more miles to conduct services in other Churches on the Sunday of Synod.

In the second place we wish to call attention to what may be designated as good manners in the Church. No person of culture will conduct himself in a parlor as he does in a school room or public hall. When he enters the house of his neighbor he does not put his feet on the parlor chairs or sit on the table. He comports himself in harmony with the place. The Church is a holy place. It is consecrated to the worship and service of the Lord God. Here is where prayer is wont to be made; here the word of God is preached and the most solemn ordinances administered. The use to which the house is devoted gives it its character. The altar, pulpit, reading desk and font enclosed by the chancel rail constitute the inmost sanctuary of the house of God. The Church with its various appointments ought to receive the respect due it by those who occupy it. This is something that ministers of the Gospel are prone to forget at the meetings of Classis and Synod. To loaf against the altar, to sit on, step over or put the feet on the chancel rail is exceedingly bad church manners. The acts of some ministers at the ecclesiastical gatherings would indicate that the consecration of the Church had for the time being been withdrawn. Things are done in connection with Synodical meetings in and about the chancel that are shocking to a proper sense of church propriety. The people are frequently taught to respect the house of God. They are reminded that it is a place of prayer; a place where the Lord draws nigh in order that the people may hold communion and

fellowship with Him, and that consequently it is a holy place. But what impression will the people receive when they witness ministers flagrantly violating the requirements of good manners in the sanctuary of the Lord? In justification of such offenses it may be said that they are thoughtlessly committed. But have ministers of the Gospel the right to be thoughtless in such matters? Has anyone the right to forget the common proprieties of life? When one stands before an earthly king or in the presence of ladies, when he is in the parlor of his friend or at the dinner table of his host he is in duty bound to conduct himself in keeping with the place and surroundings. In like manner every Christian man and woman especially every minister of the Gospel ought to remember the proprieties of the place when he enters the Church consecrated by prayer and worship, and as he moves about its most sacred appointments he ought to do so in a respectful manner. Sitting on the altar or pulpit or chancel rail or any other department of the same general character are acts that are very much to be deplored. These words are written because there seems to be a demand that attention be called to the improprieties that are only too frequently committed in the house of God.

In this connection we desire to call attention to another matter more or less closely related to the subject just discussed, A certain respect is also due ministers of the Gospel because of the position they occupy in the Church. The office they fill ought to challenge the respect of the people. It may be said that if the occupants of the office merit respect they will also receive it; that the people of the present day have no special regard for the office or station of life a man may occupy, but only for the character of the man himself. But such ought not be the case. Official position, unless the person in it is entirely unfit for the place, ought to command the respect of the people in accordance with the dignity and importance of the office. And we believe that this duty is also generally recognized by the people. It has been charged against the American people that they are lacking in good manners and

that their children are not taught to show respect towards their elders and persons in official stations. Whether there be any real foundation for this charge we cannot say, but we are convinced that in the matter of respect for ministers the people need instruction. And one of the best ways for ministers to instruct the people is by example. There is a proper and an improper form of addressing ministers and of speaking of them; the one is respectful and polite and the other is not, and some ministers in their public utterances fail to make the distinctions. Correct forms of speech are Rev. A. B. Blank, Rev. Mr. Blank and Mr. Blank. Incorrect forms so frequently heard are Rev. Blank and simply Reverend. If the minister is a bearer of the title of Doctor of Divinity the correct forms to be employed (some in writing, others in speaking) are Rev. A. B. Blank, D.D., Rev. Dr. Blank, Dr. Blank and simply Doctor. The incorrect forms are Rev. Blank, Mr. Blank and Reverend. The term Reverend is not a title strictly speaking. It is not a *name*—not a noun—it is an adjective. A title is a name, Judge, General, Professor, Doctor and the like are nouns and may be legitimately used in addressing persons. But reverend being an adjective when applied to a person as above mentioned becomes of the nature of a nick-name. The word reverend belongs to the same general class with honorable, respectable and the like. The people do not mean to be disrespectful or impolite in calling a minister Reverend, but in fact it is not a respectful form of address. Nathanael Hawthorne is speaking of the conduct of the people in a carnival in the city of Rome says: “popular rudeness is sometimes the symptom of rude moral health.” Applying the underlying idea of the quotation to the case in hand we may say that although the people employ an improper form of speech they mean to be respectful and polite. Nevertheless they need instruction, and ministers ought to show them a good example in this matter. But quite frequently they are guilty of using the same improper terms in their writings and public addresses. These infractions of polite

forms of speech appear frequently in country newspapers and rural correspondence and in some religious papers too; but they are seldom found in city papers and periodicals of literary culture. It seems to us that ministers ought to pay some attention to politeness of speech and furnish the people with correct examples in speaking to and of one another. It is a proverbial saying that if anyone does not respect himself neither can he expect others to respect him. If the members of a profession do not employ polite forms of speech in addressing one another neither will others do so. Ministers ought to be examples of culture, politeness and good manners. If they are lacking in these regards what can be expected of the people in general?

The matters presented by this paper may be considered by some as too trivial to demand attention. In our opinion they are of sufficient importance to receive the earnest consideration of the ministers of the Church.

## VII.

### CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

#### THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND THE INCARNATION.

Several years ago, Bishop Gore in his Bampton Lecture on the incarnation, declared that among subjects of modern religious controversy, "not the least important from a *philosophical* view-point, was that of the virgin birth of Christ." More recently the Dean of Westminster has written that no well-informed person in our day, "would dispute that under the influence of '*natural science*' there has come into the minds of many thoughtful men, a very serious disquietude in regard to the doctrine of the virgin birth." And in that remarkable brochure by Professor Lobstein of Strasbourg University, noticed by the late lamented editor of this Review, Doctor William Rupp, in some of its earlier pages,\* readers are counseled to give up on grounds of *historical criticism*, their confidence in the particular passages of Matthew and Luke in which the virgin birth of the Saviour is recorded, and assured that such "surrender does not imperil the imperishable essence of the Christian faith."† These three distinguished writers may be taken as representative of that large class, who from considerations of speculative philosophy, of physical science, and of the critical investigation of the first and third of the synoptic narratives, are realizing that around the virgin birth of Christ and the incarnation of the Son of God, as a doctrinal centre of prime importance for the Chris-

\* See THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1898, pp. 281-283.

† Lobstein's "The Virgin Birth, An Historical and Critical Essay," p. 38.

tian faith, the controversial storms of the age are more and more gathering.

It can be a matter of no surprise, therefore, that contributions to the literature\* on the subject should be so rapidly multiplying, and that not a few of the foremost Christian thinkers here at home and abroad should feel themselves called upon to write for the relief, if possible, of the present distress of faith and to conserve the doctrine of a real incarnation of the Son of God through virgin birth.

Among these thinkers, is there anyone in America, entitled to a more respectful hearing upon the subject, than Doctor Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University? Where is there a writer with ampler knowledge, purer literary style, better accredited sanity and balance of judgment, keener sensitiveness to evidence, finer philosophical temper, and manlier courage to express and follow the truth as he sees it, than the author of "The Immanence of God,"—one of the great books of last year? In an essay† published by him a few months ago on the "Incarnation," there are several paragraphs, one on the meaning and metaphysics of the doctrine as a possible fact, another on the religious and practical significance of the fact and doctrine, than which it would be hard to find anything more convincing in logical argument, or more winsome in the 'sweet reasonableness' with which it is set forth. In it he frankly acknowledges the difficulties which, upon the mention of the infinite coming to dwell in the finite through the incarnation, at once suggest themselves to the imagination of men, and which are to superficial thought so great, as to make many hasten to the conclusion that the doctrine is absurd and the fact impossible.

\* Cf. *The American Journal of Theology*, January, 1906; *The Princeton Theological Review*, October, 1905; "Andrew's Man and the Incarnation," Putnam's, 1905; Peyton's, "The Incarnation," Clark's, 1905; and Bowne on the same subject.

† Published in *The Japan Daily Mail* of October 7, 1905, for the courtesy of sending a copy of which to America, grateful acknowledgements are here made to the Rev. W. H. Seiple, Ph.D., of Sendai.

With equal frankness he points out however that the appeal to the imagination is mistaken, and that that faculty in this matter has no jurisdiction. Even we ourselves, he shows, are not confined to a finite body in the sense of its containing us. Being in the body means simply and only having a type of experience which is physically conditioned. Being in the world means only having a certain type of experience with certain forms and laws. Passing out of the world would mean the passing simply from one type and condition of experience to another. And being a man in general means only existence under certain conditions and laws, so that if any being should become subject to the conditions, laws and limitations of human life, that being would by that fact and so far forth, in the only intelligible sense of the phrase, be a human being.

By the incarnation of our Lord, we must understand therefore, he affirms, that "the Son of God became subject to the conditions, laws and limitations of human life, and that thus he became in the true sense of the word a man. It is in this sense that we must interpret Christ's assuming and living our life through the incarnation. This is intelligible at least in its meaning, and this is enough. When we say more than this we soon lose ourselves in words and bad metaphysics." Were these views consistently held and the warning carefully heeded, is it not clear that far less difficulty would be encountered in seeking to apprehend the meaning of the mystery here under reference? And as to the possibility of such self-limitation on the part of the Son of God in becoming incarnate, the author of this essay is candid enough to say, "we can know nothing, just as we must confess also that we know equally little how it is impossible. The progress of scientific and philosophic reflection, is making the problems of fundamental existence more and more mysterious, and by revealing the limitations and relativity of our thought, is making thoughtful men more and more careful in pronouncing on what is possible or impossible apart from the indications of experience." In the necessary absence of experimental data on which to



express a positive judgment, attention is invited to the net results of theological study on the one hand, and of Christological thought on the other. That of the first is that "while God in his absolute existence must always remain an unfathomable mystery to us, we come nearest the truth when we think of God as the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. This is the doctrine of the Trinity, a doctrine, mysterious enough no doubt, but after all the line of the least resistance, both from the biblical and philosophical standpoint. There is no view that is not attended with great difficulty when we try to think it through. The conception of a community of persons in the unity of the divine existence is no worse off in this respect, than the conception of a single and lonely personality, without the eternal fellowship which moral life demands. Likewise the net result of the second is that Jesus was not merely the Son of Mary, but also the Son of God, who took upon him the laws and experiences of the human lot, in order that he might lift us to God. This is the doctrine of the incarnation, which depends for its possibility on the other doctrine of the Trinity." All this is well put, and ought to assist men in holding fast to scriptural conceptions, rather than to embrace others involved in more impenetrable obscurity.

When the religious and practical significance of the doctrine is brought under review, Doctor Bowne's reflections are uncommonly cogent and satisfactory. Constituted as it is, our human world can receive no revelation of God at all to be compared with the self-manifestation made in the incarnation of his Son. Were the end of self-manifestation, the revelation of mere power and intelligence, or of a certain measure of goodness in the arrangements of the natural world, no incarnation would have been required. "But the higher revelation of moral love in the highest degree," we must all acknowledge with him, "lies far beyond these things, and is involved in that order of revelation for which the incarnation stands." Therein we learn more than the largely negative and abstract thing which the older theologies considered under

the topic of divine holiness. Therein we are taught more of God than those theologies conceived of in speaking of God as the moral governor of the universe, and as the executor of righteous laws. Those theologies and the old philosophies hardly recognized God as being ethical at all. For them he was a mere metaphysical perfection, free very largely if not entirely, from care or thought of his creatures, who as sinners were unworthy of and beneath his notice.

Under the compelling force of a deeper knowledge of what is implied in the doctrine of the incarnation, Christian thought has in our day been moved far away however from such inadequate notions. Upon this, Professor Bowne insists with just emphasis. "In the light of present-day knowledge," he says, "we see God to be the most deeply obligated being in existence, to be bound by moral principles even more than we who are his children. The recognition that God is love, has forced men to give up their absolutist notions of divine sovereignty, on which the theologies of a hundred years were based, and has led them to see that consistent with his name of love, he must do the works of love, and be all that love implies. Otherwise love were not love. This supreme requirement of the Christian conception of God is met, and met only, in the incarnation; in the giving of himself in the person of his Son as a sacrifice for us, thus becoming the chief burden-bearer and leader of all in self-abnegation. The incarnation signifies the filling-full of all the possibilities of moral responsibility and divine grace. There is nothing beyond this. The heroic, the loving, self-sacrificing God stands revealed in this highest possible revelation of himself in the incarnate Son. For love's sake, love's highest and supreme requirement is met in this doctrine of the incarnation."

The practical religious outcome of this self-manifestation on the part of God is to be seen in the achievements of Christian history and civilization. Its inspirational and uplifting power is always finding response in the depths of the human soul, and must continue to do so with increased and more

pervasive power as the true nature and the implications of the incarnation come to be more fully and generally understood. "It is the incarnate Son of God,"—to quote once more from our essayist,—“that is bearing the sins and sorrows of men, and is faithful unto death, in order that he may know the love and righteousness of God and redeem unto himself the world of men. The divine Son identifies himself with the least of these his brethren, so that whatever is done to them is done to him. These things are the essence of Christianity; but what becomes of them apart from the incarnation? It is one thing if only a Jewish peasant uttered these words; it is quite another if the speaker was the Lord of life and glory!” In the recognition of the truth that in the doctrine of the incarnation the self-sacrificing love of God, and even the ethical perfection and moral grandeur of his character, are bound up, we discover the explanation of men’s clinging so tenaciously to the mystery of the virgin birth and the incarnation. “It contains all that is distinctively Christian. No wonder that Paul cries out, ‘God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!’ No wonder that Peter declares that angels desire to look into this grace of God! Surely in neither earth nor heaven is there anything great or divine besides! And we may be perfectly sure that no lower conception of God will permanently command the minds and hearts of men.”

From these observations intended to meet the philosophical difficulties underlying the incarnation, we may turn now to similarly forceful and persuasive arguments addressed to that large class whose faith is disturbed if not destroyed by the revelations of ‘natural science’ supposedly contradictory of the Christian doctrine of the incarnation. The arguments to which reference is made are set forth with signal ability in a recently published little volume on “The Incarnation”\* by the Reverend William W. Peyton, of England, who brings to his task a rare equipment for successful effort. Quoting Huxley’s words of twenty-five years ago that “virgin procreation

\* Peyton’s, “The Incarnation,” A. and C. Black, London, 1905.

and resuscitation from apparent death are ordinary phenomena for the naturalist," he confidently affirms that Science itself has written a chapter on virgin reproduction, quite as mysterious as that contained in the gospel narratives,—one that makes quite as large demands on credulity, as Christianity does on faith, and yet is unquestioningly accepted by the rank and file of modern physicists. For this author "virgin birth is a supreme function of nature, overt and cryptic through whole realms to this day, and therefore its appearance in the human family, as it is alleged to have done in the case of Jesus' birth by the writers of the first and third gospels, need not be regarded as "a violent irruption into the course of nature." He finds the incarnation idea to be a foundation principle of creation, and virgin generation to have a large, long place in the evolutionary scheme and processes of nature. And accordingly the application of the epithets 'miraculous' and 'supernatural' in an exceptional sense to the virgin birth of our Saviour, are, to his mind, no longer allowable.

There are spiritual interferences admittedly observable in many epochs along the entire evolutionary course of natural development, and it seems not unreasonable to ask, why upon the ground of a similar intervention the birth of Christ should not seem explainable? "In the advent of the Son of God," says Doctor Peyton, "the divine purposes were to reach their culmination," and if anywhere intervention can be justified, it must be here. "Through the incarnation the one main dynamic was to be provided, for the ennoblement of individual character, for the revelation of the inestimable value of every human soul together with its immortal destiny, and for the humanizing and transfiguration of society in the family, the community, in the state, and in the race. Why allow intervention at lower and less important epochs, and deny it with reference to the supreme event of history?"

For want of space, the pleasure it would otherwise be to follow the argument of this book further must be sacrificed.

It must content us to note that its pages gather a large detail of facts from the 'lower creation' of plant life, from the 'higher creation' of animal life, and from the earlier historic examples of human nature, to confirm its main contentions. It lays under tribute the vast results of its author's wide scientific and historical researches, of his comprehensive knowledge of poetry and art,—all of which are marshalled with commanding skill to serve his purposes. It can hardly fail to give valuable and illuminating suggestions to minds that have been perplexed by the seemingly irreconcilable discrepancies, on the one hand of natural science in general and of the evolutionary hypothesis in particular, and on the other hand of the fundamental mystery affirmed in the New Testament Scriptures. Properly understood, the book shows, no such irreconcilable differences to exist, and that one may consistently be a scientist and theistic evolutionist and at the same time an intelligent believer in the virgin birth of the incarnate Son of the eternal Father.

In addition to the foregoing suggestions for the relief of distressed faith caused by philosophical or scientific considerations, a word or two should perhaps be said in regard to the third source from which embarrassment comes to men's minds,—namely, the claims of critical scholars with reference to the 'virgin' accounts of the Saviour's birth contained in the first and third of our gospel records. Lobstein, whom we have quoted in the first paragraph, it is of course well known, is not the only one among critics that declines to accept those accounts as historically authentic. There are many who regard those passages just as he does,—additions that have been made to the original documents possibly by mistake, probably with design. There are many others\* however whose opinion is not without weight, that hold to the traditional view, regarding them as trustworthy as any other portion of those records. Amid such disagreement of expert scholarship, the ordinary student of those narratives will feel constrained to hold his

\* Cf. *Princeton Theological Review*, October, 1905.

mind for the time being in abeyance. Let us suppose for the moment, however, that all reliable New Testament scholars should, in the pursuit of their reverent investigations, feel it necessary to homologate Lobstein's conclusions, would that oblige them or us to give up belief in the supreme and distinctive doctrine on which the whole superstructure of Christianity is resting? Elsewhere,\* the present writer has expressed his abiding conviction, that such would not at all be the necessary outcome. The assurance given by the learned professor of Strasbourg, to the effect that the surrender of belief in the historical trustworthiness of the 'virgin' passages does not "imperil faith in the imperishable essence of Christianity" seems to have been made in all sincerity, and to rest on a secure basis. In the letters of the Apostle Paul one finds no reference to the matter in question; if he had a knowledge of it, he evidently did not feel it necessary to his purpose in propogating the Gospel, to accentuate it in his discourses or epistles. And yet, nowhere in the Christian scriptures is the pre-existence of Christ more clearly and explicitly affirmed than in his writings, and nowhere is the significance or worth of the incarnate life and self-sacrificing death of the Son of God more profoundly emphasized, and carried home to the burdened hearts of sinful men. For him 'the Christ of experience,'—to use Doctor Forrest's felicitous phrase,—was the all-sufficient and universally available testimony as to the fullness of the eternal Godhead dwelling in Christ bodily, and without that testimony no verbal utterance, even though it come from the lips of an inspired Evangelist, can support a living and saving faith in Christ as the incarnate Son of the Most High. So long, therefore, as faith in the living and glorified Christ can be verified in the personal experiences of our own lives, and its value and saving power, tested and proved by its effects on our characters, so long—is it not safe to say?—Christianity itself can not be supposed to depend

\* *The Reformed Church Messenger*, December 18, 1902, "Immanuel, God With Us."

upon this or that disputed passage, however beautiful its charm and poetry, in our sacred writings. One will never be able to give up the two 'virgin' accounts without reluctance and regret, but if competent Christian research compels it, one will without them still be able to say in language sanctified by the use of it through centuries: "Thou art the King of glory, O, Christ. Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father. When thou hadst tasted the sharpness of death, thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers."

"THE MATERIAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY."

Well-deserved and wide-spread applause has been gratefully accorded by the Christian public to the author of "Mind and Matter,—A Criticism of Haeckel's 'Riddle of the Universe.' " Within the small compass of less than a score of pages one finds here a merciless and successful exposure of the unscientific dogmatism of Haeckel and his unwarranted assumptions. In a recent issue of what is probably the leading contemporary theological publication,\* the same writer, who is the Principal of the University of Birmingham, returns to discuss under the above heading, some kindred topics suggested by the earliest criticism which had made its first printed appearance in the same pages. Of those topics, and arising very naturally, are the questions of personal immortality, and of the resurrection. Both of these are unhesitatingly and unequivocally affirmed, and vigorously supported.

The way in which this is done will hardly satisfy, however, such as are accustomed to cling pertinaciously to the letter of traditional creeds. He declines, for instance, to accept that interpretation of the word "body" which makes it to imply a physical restoration of it, in the language,—“I believe in the resurrection of the body.” ‘Bodily resurrection,’ in his view, is one of the ‘legends’ which the state of belief at the time had almost inevitably to produce in connection with the disappearance of Christ’s body from the tomb. But in our day, he says,

\* *The Hibbert Journal*, January, 1906, article by Sir Oliver Lodge.



"the idea of the immortal in him, rejoining the corpse in that sense is unthinkable and repulsive; it could arise only in an age of ignorance." The Nicene phrase, 'resurrection of the dead,' is equally unsatisfying to him, since "that which survives is just that which had never died." He prefers the Pauline conception, and argues that "any immortal part must have the power of constructing for itself a suitable vehicle of manifestation," and to him this possible vehicle must be "the essential meaning of the word body in the particular article of the creed. "The identity of the material particle does not constitute the identity of the person, nor is it essential to the identity of the body."

With reference specially to the resurrection of Christ, Principal Lodge makes these interesting and suggestive observations: "That he should surmise death, that he should afterwards be able to appear to worshippers, that he would exert a perennial and edifying influence on his disciples of all time—all this is orthodox, and all this is not repugnant to science as I conceive it. Is anything more, necessary? The difficulties introduced by the effort to contemplate the circumstances of anything approaching physical resuscitation, or reëmployment of the same body, are very great. The body notoriously had not its old properties, for it appeared and disappeared, and penetrated walls. The appearances during the forty days are not inconsistent with the legends of apparitions the world over, and a farewell phantasmal appearance described as an Ascension is credible enough."

The line of argument pursued by Sir Oliver is by no means exclusively his alone. One of the most learned and versatile of present-day writers, whose books and contributions to periodical literature are just now so eagerly and attentively read by tens of thousands on both sides of the water, follows precisely the same course of thought in his chapter on "What is the Resurrection?"\* "Everywhere in the four-fold narrative of the gospels," he declares, "those who study the

\* Brierley's "The Eternal Religion," pp. 75-85. Whittaker, 1906.

whole of it carefully will discover, there is the idea of a manifestation subsequent to Christ's death that takes the form of an unearthly, immaterial, and wholly spiritual happening, \* \* \* and any theory which takes the post-mortem gospel stories into account, must square itself with them. They dispose utterly of the idea that in the minds of the writers, the appearance to the first disciples was in a body which even resembled in character and quality that which had been laid in the grave."

And it is pointed out by Doctor Brierley, that precisely here are met and answered the objections of those who ask, 'What on this theory is to be made of the empty tomb, and what became of the body of Jesus?' The answer he gives is quite simple. "We do not know, nor does anyone else. That is one of the secrets of history." A darkness rests on these details, De Wette is quoted to have observed, which, with our present information, it is impossible to penetrate. "But let it be immediately noticed," he continues, "that if the view here taken throws no light on this point, neither does any other theory that holds clearly to the biblical accounts. A form which made men 'suppose they had seen a spirit,' which appeared suddenly in a room where the doors were closed, and which vanished without warning from men's sight, whatever it might be, was assuredly, we repeat, not the physical form that was interred in Joseph's tomb. Moreover the transformation of the one into the other is neither scientific nor biblical." For the benefit of those who feel inclined on supposed biblical grounds to register a demurrer to these conclusions, he adds, that "apart from other considerations, the supposition of a physical resurrection, would be in flat contradiction of St. Paul's argument: 'That which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body which shall be, \* \* \* so also is the resurrection of the dead.' That is a sufficient clew, and it is a credible one. \* \* \* The resurrection, in fine, was the psychic manifestation of the departed Lord. That was for the first disciples the Easter faith. It was the faith that converted them, and

started them forth to convert the world, and what was good enough for them should be good enough for us."

But why should we select Brierley's words to show that the author of "The Material Element in Christianity" is not alone in holding these views, when those of one of our own Reformed Church ministers, equally explicit and convincing, and already more than ten years old, offer themselves to the same purpose? Is it because it still remains true as in the days of the Psalmist, that 'the eyes of the fool are in the ends of the earth?' That question aside, it is certainly true that as yet our Church has not put a proper estimate upon the scholarly insight and spiritual apprehension of Christian truth in the light of results achieved by modern physical and theological science, which are disclosed in the pages of the late Doctor Calvin S. Gerhard's unpretentious little volume on "Death and the Resurrection."\* Many, it may be said with considerable confidence, perhaps even of our own ministers, will read Lodge and Brierley and glory in the "new" doctrinal discoveries made in their writings, without being aware that their conclusions had been anticipated by more than a decade in the undervalued and largely neglected book which our still-mourned-for brother left as his richest legacy for the enlightenment and comfort of his fellow Christians. If ten or twelve years ago the mind of the American Church was not sufficiently prepared to appreciate and welcome his utterances on these topics, is it too much to hope that now by the re-examination of its lucid, calm and illumining pages, due credit may yet be given to the name of its distinguished author?

Like the writers above quoted, Doctor Gerhard was fully persuaded that by holding definitely to the scriptural records, one can not believe in a physical resurrection of the body of Christ. "How did he appear?" he asks. "Was there in his case a resuscitation of the corpse? Did he fail to see corruption, because before corruption set in his corpse was revived?"

\* Published by the Reformed Church Publication Board, Philadelphia, Pa., 1895.

According to the analogy which he himself uses we must answer this question in the negative. He said of himself: 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit.' \* \* \* This analogy leads us to the conclusion that not the glorification, but the dissolution, of his natural body formed the condition of his resurrection into the new form of life. \* \* \* What became of his corpse we need not, therefore, be at a loss to know, for if we carry out his own analogy we must necessarily conclude that it followed the universal law of, 'Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.' \* \* \* His corpse was resolved into its original elements and thus escaped corruption, not by glorification, but by immediate dissolution."

The instantaneousness of the transformation of the Saviour's corpse, as thus affirmed, it is pointed out in a later paragraph, "is not more magical than his sudden manifestations of himself on the third day after the crucifixion and his equally abrupt subsequent appearances and disappearances. Everything relating to his resurrection lies above and beyond the plane of the natural. The rapid development of his spiritual body implies the equally rapid dissolution of his corpse, not by setting it aside, but by accelerating the activity of the laws by means of which atomic centres of force are brought into new relations and adjustments." This is in entire accord with Lodge's dictum that any immortal part must have the power of constructing for itself a suitable vehicle for self-manifestation, and shows that its author had a firmer grasp and clearer conception of the underlying facts than the prolific British writer. What the latter calls 'power' was designated by Doctor Gerhard 'invisible and intangible forces,' by the calling of which,—not ordinarily operative in Christ's risen state,—into exercise when desired, Jesus "could make himself visible," it is declared, "to the eyes of his disciples." To constantly increasing numbers in the Church results of scientific research and biblical study, such as these, are cordially welcome. By new interpretations of their language, the creeds may be given assent and valid affirmation.

## VIII.

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE HOME.\*

PROF. GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

The normal man lives his life in the home, the school, the church and the state. These social organisms are rooted in the human constitution, and in them men are to work out their divine destiny. The home is first both in time and in importance. It is the unit of the social order and has specific functions to perform in the education of the race.

The significance of the home is now more recognized than ever before. Jesus gave it the proper place in the religious life. He was himself an obedient child. He attended a wedding and was a guest at Bethany. He made the social life to be the sphere for the unfolding of the religious life. The home, not the monastery, is the school of saints. The sociologist, the pedagogue, the ethicist and the evangelist unite in magnifying the influence of the family. Mulford said: "Sociology is the coming science and the family holds the key to it." No less significant is the statement that "a child's first teacher is the one who loves it first." Martensen wrote: "The family forms the commencement and the foundation of the moral world." Jerry McAuley made an almost startling assertion, when he said: "Far be it from me to limit the grace of God, but I never yet knew a man to be permanently reclaimed who did not have a good mother." In his study of revivals Davenport concludes that "a sound family religion furnishes the only sufficient basis for healthy evangelism."

From these testimonies it appears that what men have

\* This paper was read at the Inter-Church Conference on Federation, New York City, November 15, 1905.

always instinctively felt and Christ has taught, science corroborates,—the primacy of the home in the development of the individual and the social life.

We can only understand the part which the home is to take in religious education when we have a definite idea of what religious education is. Since religious education embraces not only a part of man's life but has to do with the whole of it, religious education must include the whole educational system. Protestantism does not draw a line between the religious and the secular. Human life in all its phases is sacred, and all its institutions are divine. The only line of division is that between the christian and the unchristian, the good and the bad. By living in the social organisms in which we are born we are to be educated for the kingdom of love, righteousness and freedom. Each one of these organisms is of God and has its own peculiar place in the divine plan of education.

Dr. Butler defines education as "a gradual adjustment to the spiritual inheritance." The inheritance is fivefold: the scientific, the literary, the esthetic, the politico-social and the religious. If we accept this division, we shall find the home to be specially adapted to lead men into the last two forms of inheritance—the politico-social and the religious. For a home may be a good home without literary, scientific or esthetic culture, but it cannot be a home at all without making or marring the social and religious life of its members. In these respects it wields an influence different in degree, if not in kind, from that of the school, the church or the state. It must be remembered, however, that these latter institutions also have farreaching social and religious value.

We are now confronted by a second question. What portion of the religious inheritance is the home to transmit? The answer requires a definition of religion. It is presupposed that the only form of religion which is considered by this assembly is Christianity. It would not be prudent to attempt a scientific definition of the essence of Christianity at this time. That problem seems to have taken, in our day, the place of the

sacramental question in the 16th century, in being a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. When, however, we approach Christianity from the human or moral side, it is not so difficult to find common ground upon which the church universal may stand. Jesus defined it as love—love of God and love of men. Paul speaks of it as righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. James describes pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father as visiting the fatherless and widows and keeping oneself unspotted from the world. Sabbatier says it is “a filial feeling toward God and a fraternal feeling toward men.” The home is not a school of theology. It is not to teach church history nor dogmatics. It is a school, so far as it is a school, for training in Christian living. Whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are lovely are to be taught in the home. The child should breathe in the atmosphere of love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness and temperance.

The work of education in the family must be done in two ways: first, by influence and second, by instruction.

By virtue of its constitution the home teaches religion. In it the three great factors, which work together in the making of manhood, cooperate. They are hereditary, environment, and personality. These forces become concrete by being embodied in the living personalities of the family. They have a subtle power over its members. If heredity or environment are to be modified or overcome, it must be done largely by the force of personality. In the domestic circle personality has free scope, and is able, by reason of the mutual confidence which exists and the plastic condition of childhood, to do its greatest work. The natural relations into which the members of a family enter call forth the essentially Christian virtues. Compare the home with the school or state, and the difference will at once appear. In the school you find the relations of a teacher, a pupil and a classmate. In the state you have the executive, the citizen, and the fellow-citizen. These relations



have educational value. They are indispensable in character-building. In the home, however, you have husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, kindred and friends. In the domestic relations a part of human nature is touched which neither the school nor the state can reach. In passing from the former to the latter you pass from the sphere of love to that of law. The one draws the other drives.

Marriage itself rests upon love, chastity and service. The parental and filial relations require obedience, reverence, self-assertion and self-sacrifice. The ethical principles which are required for a prosperous state and a live church are in a measure of necessity developed in the home.

One of the primary purposes of Christian nurture is to make the child realize the presence of God in his life and in the world about him. God's presence may be particularly manifest in the family life. Here love prevails, the spirit of truth rules, noble aspirations are kindled. These are for the child a form of the divine presence and an interpretation of the character of God. The father's love is the nearest approach on earth to the love of God. Jesus reveals the goodness of the heavenly Father, by comparing it to the love of an earthly father. "Or what man is there among you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone; or if he shall ask him for a fish will give him a serpent? \* \* \* How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good gifts to them that ask him?" A mother's sympathy typifies that of God. "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you" (Isai. 66: 13). The joys and sorrows, the births and deaths, the successes and failures which are inevitable in the family are occasions by which men are taught the truth of Christ.

It is not a mere accident that the forms for Jesus' revelation are taken from the home. The Christian name for God is "Father." Men are called "sons of God." Religion is fellowship between the heavenly Father and his children, between men and brethren. Even the *natural* home is a preparation

for the higher fellowship of the kingdom. The *Christian* home is the highest form of the kingdom in the present dispensation. The home, accordingly, educates men in religion by virtue of what it is, by the environment which it creates, and by the requirements which it makes on the personal life of its members.

The education of the home is not to be simply by influence but also by direct instruction. Here we meet with the most difficult problem of the church in this generation. It is universally conceded that family worship, the teaching of the Bible and the practice of daily prayer have inestimable value for the development of the Christian life. The parent can teach with an authority which neither the pastor nor the teacher can have. The disposition of reverence and sympathy, in parents, for religious matters is readily communicated to the child. Cordial coöperation in the work of the congregation will attach the child's heart to the church. The humble acceptance of adversity and prosperity as from God, the patient bearing of burdens, the sublime optimism of faith, will determine the child's attitude toward God. The child should be impressed with the conviction that he is a child of God and brought up in the faith and hope of the Gospel. Mr. Moody believed that "we might train children that they should be converted so early that they can't tell when they were converted." He reached the conclusion of Bushnell, who occupied a different standpoint, that "a child is to grow up a Christian and never know himself as being otherwise."

A number of obstacles interfere with the educational work of the home. Even Christian homes are under the influence of false standards of life. There is a wide difference between the Gospel proclaimed from the pulpit and the spirit which shapes the ambitions of the home. The contradiction between profession and practice is nowhere so evident as in the privacy of the family and is instinctively felt by the children. Parents have little enthusiasm for the practical training of children in Christian ideals. They are captivated by the subtle material-

ism of the age. The temporal prospects of children are of greater concern to parents than their eternal welfare. Love of money, pleasure, position and display have superseded the love of Christ. Success is put above character, gold above goodness. Many a Christian mother and some preachers of the Gospel would not urge their sons to enter the ministry because the sacrifice is too great. Men confess the cross, sing it, and glory in it, but shrink from laying it on the backs of their children. The spirit of the home must be transformed before it can take effective part in Christian education.

Many evangelical churches have followed the emotional and revivalistic system of religion to such an extent that the educational system has fallen into disuse. By implication religious education of children is worthless. The child is excluded from the church or the kingdom until the sign of election is given or the travail of an instantaneous conversion is experienced. Even in the churches where the catechetical methods are in vogue and children are to be brought up in Christ from infancy, family training is neglected and Christian nurture is left to pastors, teachers, and schools. A false reliance on the sacraments and ordinances of the church has minimised the importance of religious education. The day has come when protestants ought to unite in the advocacy of the educational system of religion. It is a revival of original protestantism, and by no means an innovation. It is vindicated not only by long experiment but by the latest results of psychology and pedagogy. The Holy Spirit works through truth. The Grace of God is the truth of Christ come to life in the conscience of men. The sacraments are only grace-bearing when they are truth-bearing. The appreciation of these fundamental principles will awaken the sense of responsibility in parents for the Christian training of children as well as convince them that their work is not a fruitless task which the Spirit of God will set aside by a conversion that is far more magical than miraculous and more unnatural than supernatural.

Social and industrial conditions interfere with Christian education in the home. Parents may be willing to train children in religion, but they have neither the time, ability nor courage. In the struggle for life men and women are hard pressed for time. Even the Sabbath is invaded by industrial, social or ecclesiastical pursuits. The family circle around the fireside, discussions of religious topics, and family prayer are impracticable in many Christian households. The minds of parents and children are so absorbed by the current topics of the day that religious matters are rarely approached and only with great diffidence.

How may these obstacles be removed? The sacredness and the privacy by which the home is hedged in make it all the more difficult to remedy its defects. It cannot be done by legislation nor by new organizations. Help must come from the church and from the school. By the "foolishness of preaching" the general tone of the family life must be improved. The ideals in parents in reference to the purpose of life must be christianized. The responsibilities of the home for the religious development of children should be laid upon the hearts of men. Proclamation, agitation and education will arouse the conscience and stir men to action. On this point protestantism can unite and with the spiritual weapons of the Gospel reclaim the home as a potent factor for religious education.

Personal influence is indispensable. The pastor by wise direction can help the parents do what they actually desire to do, but for want of method and courage have left undone. Forms of prayer for use in the family, selections from the Scriptures, catechisms and religious literature will aid the inexperienced and diffident parent. The cottage prayer-meeting may open the way into the home for the family altar. The Sunday-school, through its home department, may be made an agency for reviving the interest in Christian nurture at home.

While the spirit and the content of religious education come from the church, it is the mission of the school to work

out a method of teaching based on psychological and pedagogical principles. Instinct has generally guided mothers in the rearing of children, yet instinct is to be turned into a rational course of action by the light of scientific investigation. The thoughtful parent will have an open mind for suggestions from the pedagogue and psychologist.

Whatever methods we use, we need the patience of the saints in this work. In spiritual and moral matters we should be satisfied if men progress an inch a century. Family customs cannot be changed in a moment nor the life of communities in a day.

Behind the question of religious education in the home is the still greater problem of saving the home itself. The tendencies which threaten its very being are legion. Its physical bases are unsound. Parents are impure. Tainted blood has been flowing through generations of vicious ancestors. Conception and pregnancy are accidents. Economic conditions interfere with a normal home life. A large proportion of men and women do not have the money necessary for the rearing of a family. The gravitation of population toward the cities is unfavorable to domestic happiness. It is hard to have a home in crowded tenements or in gilded palaces. Children are not wanted in hotels, apartment houses, ocean liners, and summer resorts. With time divided between society and business men and women have no room for religious instruction. Children are given into the care of nurses, governesses and school-teachers. Individualism is one of the fruits of protestantism, but a onesided emphasis of it has helped to disintegrate families. The increasing wealth and luxury of our country wean men away from the enjoyment of the pleasures of home.

These statements raise problems for the sociologist, the statesman and the reformer. They have, under God's guidance, an important work to do. Their work is not any less divine because their methods are scientific. Still the mountain which rises before Zerubbabel must become a plain," not

by might nor by power but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." The spirit which makes a Christian home must come from Christ through his Church. Science is to give wise direction to the spirit of love and service. Then the home will become a scientifically religious factor in the Christian education of men.

LANCASTER, PA.

## IX.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### CHRISTIANITY AND ETHICS.

If Christianity is the highest type, the one universal form of religion, it must have something in common with all other forms or else it would not belong to the genus religion. Again, if all forms of religion involve two factors, the divine and the human, and the character of any form of religion depends upon the way in which these factors are apprehended and made to affect each other, there are two aspects from which Christianity is to be contemplated and in the light of which its real nature and significance are to be judged. Schleiermacher assumed that religion had its seat primarily in feeling and characterized it as a feeling of absolute dependence upon God. We can understand how from this point of view it should prompt men to worship, and call forth in them the attitude of devotion and service; but, after all, this is only a one-sided aspect of it. Rosenkrantz very properly observed that as the feeling is one of dependence on God, that is on a Supreme Being, there is in it an element of strength which lifts man above the idea of mere dependence and makes him an active agent. Conduct, therefore, is to be regulated under divine sanctions, and religion, in the nature of the case, must modify the ethical standards of men in all the relations of life. Thus it happens that the ideas which men have of the Supreme Being find expression in two directions: in their systems of worship and the elaboration of a ceremonial service on the one hand, and in their moral standards controlling conduct and the ethical ideals toward which they strive on the other. But as soon as we speak of the ideas which men have of the Supreme Being, or their conception of God, we touch on a third element which has always had place in the development of religion, namely, the intellectual apprehension of God in so far as He



enters into human relations and reveals himself to the consciousness of men. Thus there are three aspects under which any form of religion presents itself to our contemplation, namely, the emotional, the intellectual and the practical or, in plainer terms, religion must be a matter of feeling, a matter of understanding, and a matter of conduct.

As all history is a process of differentiation and development it is not surprising that in different ages emphasis should be put now on one and now on the other of these factors. There have been ages of emotionalism, of orthodoxy, and of practical piety, and it is a pity, although perhaps natural, that when men lay special stress upon one of these factors, they should lose sight of the others. Undue emphasis of any aspect of life or doctrine is accompanied by danger, danger that other things will be slighted or overlooked. For this reason, in the transition from one mode of apprehension to another, sane, sober reflection is necessary to avoid those extremes which always prove hurtful to the legitimate interests of life.

The present age is undoubtedly an age of transition. In many religious denominations the forms of worship are changing. There is a wonderful shifting of opinion in the field of dogma. The question of personal and social ethics, the relation of the individual to the community is demanding an extraordinary degree of attention. But there is not only this change of attitude within the limits of each of these spheres; there is also, and this is profoundly significant, a change of view as to the relative importance of these different elements and a disposition to lay a different emphasis upon these various aspects of the Christian life. The burning question of ritualism, which a few years ago affected all religious denominations, is no longer a burning question excepting in some aspects of the controversy between high church and low church in the Episcopal communion. The tremendous upheaval of recent years in the sphere of dogmatic theology has undoubtedly had the effect of loosening the hold of orthodoxy upon the minds of perhaps a large majority of Christians.

The tendency unquestionably now is to lay stress upon the practical aspect of Christianity, to look away from faith and doctrine, and to find a bond of union in practical benevolence and the cultivation of ethical principles. Indeed, ethical questions have not only come into the foreground of daily discussion, but they have become the goal of striving even for many who profess no religious faith whatever. We have ethical culture societies, organizations and brotherhoods which relegate religion to the background, if not to the lumber-room, and boldly substitute ethics for religion as the all-sufficient remedy for the ills from which we suffer.

The change of emphasis to which we have referred might have been expected and it is, no doubt, to a certain extent justified. It is all-important, however, to observe that there is in genuine Christianity internal, vital connection between the three factors mentioned, and the sinking of any one of them out of sight necessarily vitiates the soundness of the system as a whole. Religion undoubtedly is, in its higher forms, the result of a process of evolution. So is Christianity; and it would be a condemnation of the whole system if worship were not purer and more elevating, doctrine larger, fuller and clearer and practical piety, both personal and social, of a higher order at the present day than at the beginning of the Christian church. But such a result is possible only by holding the elements together in their vital relation, each exerting its legitimate influence upon the other. The danger lies in cutting loose, in undervaluing one aspect as over against another, of substituting one for another. It is undoubtedly true that sometimes too much stress has been laid upon doctrine, and in these days we feel the full force of the reproach involved in the word *dogmatism* as derived from dogma or doctrine. We try to get rid of the rubbish which in the course of ages has accumulated in the form of antiquated doctrine. But it is a question as to how far such rubbish may be removed without removing at the same time elements of great value in the development of the Christian life. As valuable documents

are often thrown away and destroyed with rubbish, so aspects of doctrine may be forsaken on the supposition that they have no bearing upon practical Christianity when, in fact, they are of profound significance. The truth is that our ethical standards and our conception of God are closely related and interdependent. James M. Baldwin says, "The highest embodiment of the ethical ideal is the conception of the character of God. This does not give a statement of the ethical ideal, however, for the conception of God as a perfect Being is of a character which realizes our moral predicates to perfection and as such, shifts with our development and with that of the race. Instead of the end consisting in our conception of God's character, the reverse is true. God's character to us results from our conception of the moral nature." This is true in a certain sense only. Our conception of the character of God and our moral ideals are both the result of a process of development and we see the one in the light of the other. Christianity, in the nature of the case, implies the revelation of God to man, the consequent inspiration of man in his development to apprehend the character of God more fully and to perfect his ethical ideal. In proportion as he apprehends God more fully does his ethical ideal become higher, and in proportion as his ethical ideal becomes perfected he has a clearer conception of the character of God. Here then the two sides of the religious process come to view and the distinctive character of Christianity is emphasized in this, that the two come together in absolute union in the development of our human life, in the genial atmosphere of faith, and hope, and love. Ethical ideals are of profound significance and they, in the nature of the case, embody the ideals of individual and social life; but such principles may be cold and barren. To possess quickening power they must be pervaded by the spirit of the Master and glow with emotion as this is brought to view in its highest forms when Christ is born in the human soul.

Christianity, of course, is an objective order of existence and as such it had its historical beginning and its historical

development. For our purpose, however, we need to look at it from a different point of view. For individual men it becomes a reality by having its genesis in the human soul and its unfolding in the progressive development of the individual. It begins in the act of faith which is the eye of the soul, kissed into vitality by the entrance of the divine spirit. Now whatever other effects may follow, the condition of growth is found in stimulation of the will looking at once to the formation of character in harmony with the character of the great prototype of every normal healthy, human life. The object of faith may be vague at first. It becomes clearer and more definite in proportion as the mind of the Master comes to prevail in the mind of the believer. "If any man willeth to do His will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." (St. John 7: 17.) Christianity, therefore, that spends itself in ecstasy of feeling comes to naught. Christianity that resolves itself into theology or into scientific apprehension of the truths involved in the economy of divine revelation becomes cold and lifeless. Normal growth is a matter of communion with God and it is possible only by the indwelling of the divine spirit with energy to mold and fashion human life in both its individual and social aspect. In proportion as much growth takes place will knowledge become clearer and emotion more devout, and each of these in turn will react upon the unfolding life to give it tone and character.

In the light of this relation it is not difficult to see the place and function of each of the three factors to which we have referred. It is quite in order to lay stress upon ethical development and to apply the principles of Christianity to the moral problems of the present day. Indeed if Christianity does not apply to these problems, if it cannot solve them, it has no claim upon men of the present age. If Christ came to save men, he came not to save them simply from everlasting torment, but he came to save them from sin and from spiritual death, and this salvation must be effected here and now in the progressive development of the Christian life. But this cannot be effected

by the preaching of ethical principles. It can come only by a regeneration of the whole man so that his attitude toward God in the form of worship and service may be sincere and rational, his apprehension of the historical development of the church and the world (including the two processes of divine revelation and human apprehension) may become more definite and complete, and his activity in all his relations, temporal and spiritual, become fully imbued by the spirit of Him in Whom he has believed and Whom he professes to serve.

J. S. STAHR.

#### THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT.

Twenty years ago the first Students' Conference held at Northfield originated what is now called the Student Volunteer Movement. Of the two hundred and fifty students who in July, 1886, met for conference on Mount Hermon, about one hundred declared themselves willing and ready to enter the foreign missionary service. Mr. Moody, it is reported, did not at first give his countenance to the movement, saying, "It is a great pity for young men to place themselves under a pledge to enter any form of Christian work before God calls them, and he never calls a man until he is ready." This proved to be a wise caution.

The declaration of the Volunteers, "It is my purpose, if God permit, to become a foreign missionary," is exposed to the criticism that it either means practically nothing or means too much. Theoretically every Christian who aspires to special service in the cause of the Kingdom ought to be ready to go anywhere—to the place where he is most needed. If he is not, he is hardly fit to work anywhere at all. If then the declaration means anything definite, it means that the subscriber feels himself specifically called to the work abroad in contrast with any form of work at home. Here lies the danger of presumption. The stubborn, unyielding purpose to go to the foreign field is not consonant with that susceptibility to divine guidance which must characterize the truly success-

ful missionary in any field. The man of God needs a will of just the right temper, neither inflexible nor yet uncertain.

On the back of the card which Volunteers are now asked to sign is a significant explanation, which shows how the leaders of the Movement have profited by experience: "This declaration is not to be interpreted as a 'pledge,' for it in no sense withdraws one from the subsequent guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is, however, more than an expression of mere willingness or desire to become a foreign missionary. It is the statement of a definite life purpose, formed under the direction of God. The person who signs this declaration fully purposes to spend his life as a foreign missionary. Toward this end he will shape his plans; he will devote his energies to prepare himself for this great work; he will do all in his power to remove the obstacles which may stand in the way of his going; and in due time he will apply to the Boards to be sent out. Only the clear leading of God shall prevent his going to the foreign field."

The leaders of the Movement are fully aware also of the danger of flaws in the purposes that are hastily formed in the heat of convention-enthusiasm. Accordingly they now discourage the taking of pledges in any public assembly.

The chief leader of the movement, Mr. Mott, is one of the greatest statesmen of the Kingdom in our age. The writer first learned to know him sixteen years ago in the Y. M. C. A. work among the students of Pennsylvania and later observed at close range what he did for the students of Japan on his two tours through that Empire. It is safe to say that no man now living has done more for the christianization of Japan than Mr. Mott. It is also safe to say that no one has done more than he to arouse the intelligent youth of America to a due appreciation of the unprecedented missionary opportunities and obligations that now confront us as a people. Let it be added that the praise for all this belongs to God, who has evidently called him and his associates to this work and honored their faith step by step.

We are not by nature fond of conventions; but no Christian man could look upon the multitude of students, of both sexes, gathered at Nashville a few weeks ago without a feeling of profound gratitude. Of more significance even than the admirable management of the convention was the evident seriousness of the delegates, who, one might see at a glance, represented the very flower of our American youth.

The great missionary problem is one not of means but of men. It is the fixed policy of some of the strongest missionary boards to give a commission to every promising candidate for the foreign work, experience having taught that when the right men and women are on the field there is never any lack of means to support them.

We see two reasons why Christian students should be encouraged to form a resolution like that expressed in the declaration of the Volunteers.

In the first place they need to do so for the sake of preparation. There is still a gulf between the work abroad and the work at home. It is true that there ought not to be any such distinction; but the fact is that the distinction persists in the minds of our people. The foreign boards are often criticised for limiting themselves to those candidates who voluntarily offer themselves. It would be much better, it is urged, to challenge the most suitable men that can be found, regardless of applications. Those who tender this advice need to be told that experience has shown that men do not respond to such challenges unless they have for some time been preparing themselves to enter the foreign service. Even if a man is personally inclined to respond, his relatives hold him back. Accordingly time must be allowed for preparation. Perhaps it ought not to be so, and perhaps we are becoming more cosmopolitan, so that the old instinctive dread of exile from native land is fast disappearing; but we have to deal with our present environment, and in this environment it takes years to develop in a young man or woman the spirit that makes the missionary. There is this much basis for the common as-



sumption that the foreign missionary is a person of superior consecration. It would, however, be fairer to say, a person of superior preparation, of wider outlook, of peculiar prophetic vision. For as a matter of fact genuine missionary work at home may require more severe self-denial than some kinds of foreign work.

The other reason why Christian students should volunteer is that the Church needs the influence of their example. The great missionary enterprise of our age is a new thing. At every step in advance some conservative father may be expected to say, "Young man, sit down!" It may be good for the young man to hear such advice once in a while; but at the same time it depends on him whether the advance shall be made or not. While it is often the case that the Lord calls His missionaries through His Church, it is oftener the case that He calls His Church through His missionaries. It is through the personal initiative of leaders like our Hoy and Schneder that our missions have been so rapidly developed. One has only to look over old reports of the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance to see when and where those impulses had their origin. The young people of the rising generation have a similar work to do, a work which must be begun early in their lives.

It would not be wise to try to determine by rule what form the movement ought to take in any particular case. Individuals differ and so do institutions. Whether we have Volunteers in the technical sense or not, it is certain that for adequate leadership we must look to young men and women who can say: "I cheerfully devote my all to the cause. Come and help the work along!"

As the Student Volunteer Movement advances it is evidently becoming less and less emotional and more and more educational. In Mr. Mott's last report there is no more striking feature than the statement that during the last year 12,629 students were enrolled in classes for the systematic study of missions.

Further evidence of the good reflex influence of the work may be found in the statement: "Actual investigations show that in those colleges where the claims of foreign missions have been most successfully emphasized there has been the largest increase in the number of men deciding to enter the ministry."

If it were the rule that in every class of each of our educational institutions the most capable student should become a missionary to Japan or China, the gift would be none too good to devote to the cause, and, further, it would take nothing from our strength here, but rather add to it. "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth."

C. Noss.

## X.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT, THE REORGANIZATION OF THE EMPIRE AND THE TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH. By John B. Firth. Pages xii + 368. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 West Twenty-third St., 1905. Price \$1.50.

The age of Constantine is an epoch in the history of the Church. In his reign the conflict of centuries between the empire and the Church ceased. The forces which were struggling for recognition, for toleration if not for supremacy, won the victory under the first so-called Christian emperor. The character of the Church was radically changed when it became the State Church. The imperial authority became a new factor in determining the doctrine and cultus of Christianity. It is generally recognized that the peace between the empire and the Church was not an unmixed gain. The world modified the Church far more than the Church transformed the world. It is on account of the transitional character of Constantine's reign that he will always be a most interesting study for students of Church history.

The author is not a blind eulogist of his hero. He tries, as he says in the preface, to write with impartiality. This is difficult because few men have been presented with so much partisan prejudice by the ancient writers as Constantine. He was exalted to the skies by the Christians, notably by Eusebius of Cæsarea, and he was denounced by historians of the heathen party. Posterity has surnamed him "the Great"; the Greek Church has designated him the "equal of the Apostles." After reading the critical treatment in this volume we are more than ever convinced that the author is right in his judgment that "his place in the select list of the immortals is not among the highest."

The leading topics, which are treated in a satisfactory way, are the reorganization of the empire begun by Diocletian and completed by Constantine, his gradual rise, by the defeat of his rivals, to sole rulership, the last days of the persecutions, which continued in the East after the toleration edict in 311, and, of special interest, the theological controversies, Arius and Athanasius, and the Nicene Council. The author has evidently read the sources and consulted the leading authorities, but he displays an independence of judgment, which he usually bases on cited facts and references, which makes the work all the more attractive for the student of history. He weighs Eusebius, Lactantius, and

Zosimus in the balances and is not afraid to differ from them when testimony demands it.

Though the narrative is comparatively brief, it is lively and fresh from beginning to end. The reader will lay down the book, after having read it, with a vivid picture of the Constantinian age in his mind. Twenty-seven illustrations of persons and places and a list of seventeen coins of that era enhance the value of the book. One way of getting history is through biography, probably the most interesting and effective way. The history of the world is the history of its great men. It is doubtless with this principle in mind that the series of the "Heroes of the Nations," of which this volume is one, has been prepared. The general public will be interested in these publications and through them may obtain an intelligent conception of the principal movements in the history of the Occident. The student will always be glad to refresh his memory and to become acquainted with the latest views of specialists through the medium of these popular works.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

JOHN KNOX. By Henry Cowan, D.D., Professor of Church History, University of Aberdeen. Pages xxxiii + 404. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price \$1.35 net.

This volume is one of the series of the "Heroes of the Reformation." John Knox could not well be omitted from the galaxy of leading Reformers among whom are Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin and Beza. Separate volumes have been prepared on these men by specialists, and the latest conclusions of historical scholarship are presented in a critical and yet readable style. Dr. Cowan has done justice to his hero in presenting the salient events in his life and in showing his close relation to the theological and national movements not only of Scotland but of Europe. Almost from its beginning Knox was a factor in the Scottish Reformation, and he remained its dominant personality until his death. His captivity in the French galleys, his temporary residence in England, his work in Frankfort and Geneva, his return to Scotland and his inflexible attitude for reform before the Queen and the nobles are sketched with color and feeling and make fascinating reading. The readers of the REVIEW will be particularly interested in tracing the relation between the reform in Scotland and that on the Continent. After Knox and five associates had drawn up the Book of Discipline, 1560, it was submitted, in Latin translation, to Calvin, Beza, Bullinger and other Swiss Reformers, prior to its being laid before the Privy Council in January, 1561. It is stated that "Knox was influenced by the

first Helvetic Confession which George Wishart translated and brought back with him to Scotland." The second Helvetic Confession also was sent by Beza from Geneva to Knox, who, with forty other ministers and professors, examined and approved it as "resting altogether upon the Holy Scriptures." It is interesting to note, however, that they entered one exception to this Confession. They were not willing to recognize "the festivals of our Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the Sending of the Holy Ghost. These festivals obtain no place among us: for we dare not religiously celebrate any other feast day than what the divine oracles have prescribed." This statement points to a difference between the Swiss and Scotch in regard to the Church year, which became still more apparent in their respective descendants in the United States.

The author does not profess to give an exhaustive treatment of the life of Knox. For that he refers the reader to the more extensive works of Dr. McCrie, Professor Hume Brown, and Dr. David Laing. He aims "in the limited space at his disposal, to describe those portions of the career of Knox which are most likely to be of general interest; to place his life-work in its historical setting; to facilitate for students the consultation of original authorities; and to present a picture of the Reformer which, without concealing his infirmities, would help to vindicate his right to enrolment alike among the foremost heroes of the Reformation, and among the greatest and noblest of Scotsmen." The table of contents and the index are a valuable aid for reference. The list of books referred to in this work, alphabetically arranged, and the numerous footnotes furnish an almost complete bibliography. The reader who seeks simply a general knowledge of the Reformer will find this probably the most satisfactory work yet published, and the specialist who desires to go behind the statements of the author will find references enough to introduce him into the manifold sources from which the biography must be written. This volume, with the others of the series, should be found on the shelves of every preacher's library.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**THE ENGLAND AND HOLLAND OF THE PILGRIMS.** By the late Henry Martin Dexter, D.D., LL.D., and his son, Morton Dexter. Pages 673. Boston, Mass., Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905. Price \$3.50 net.

The religious movements in Great Britain and on the Continent, from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, were reflected in the American churches. To understand the Church history of the New World it is necessary to study the sources in the Old. Authors of the histories of the denominations in the

United States have devoted too little space to this phase of the subject, and have not kept in view the organic relation between the growth of the churches in this country and of those across the sea.

Dr. Briggs wrote his volume on American Presbyterianism, 1885, with this plan in view. He treats religious movements in America in their relation to contemporary movements in Europe. Another work of this sort was published in two volumes by Douglass Campbell, entitled, "The Puritans in Holland, England and America," 1892, in which he seeks to prove the thesis that the characteristic institutions, established by the Puritans in New England, were derived, directly or indirectly, not from England, but from Holland.

Probably no portion of American Church History has been more carefully studied and more extensively written upon than that of New England; yet a volume such as has been prepared by Dr. Dexter, on *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*, fills a gap in the history of the Puritan and Congregational movement.

Dr. Henry M. Dexter is an authority on New England church history, particularly on the history of the Congregationalists. He collected one of the largest libraries of Congregational literature in this country. It is now in the possession of Yale University. He wrote a book, entitled, *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years*, which will remain a classic on that subject. Another valuable publication from his pen is a *Hand-book of Congregationalism*. He spent the latter portion of his life in researches in England and Holland for the work which is now before us. But after he had written, in a rough draught, the first five chapters, and a part of the sixth, he died. The manuscript and the collected material passed into the hands of Professor Frank B. Dexter, of Yale University. His son, Morton Dexter, later added considerable material, obtained by his own research, revised the work of his father, and gave the book its present form.

The volume is a model of the printer's art, and its form is worthy of the contents which it presents. The material is divided into six books which treat the following topics: *The English of Our Fathers; The Protestantism of Our Fathers; The Birthplace of the Pilgrim Church; The Pilgrims Themselves, and How the Conflict Developed them; The Pilgrims in Amsterdam; The Pilgrims in Leyden.*

Valuable material is preserved in an appendix of fifty pages, which has been gathered by the personal researches of the editor in a seven months' sojourn in Europe. A list of the persons who

belonged to the Pilgrim Company in Leyden, with data from their lives, is given. The names are alphabetically arranged and cover forty pages. Another list is entitled, *Other English People in Leyden*, consisting of seven pages. The places in England from which the Pilgrims migrated to Holland are tabulated; and the names of the thirty-five persons who came over in 1620 in the *Mayflower*, with those who followed in 1621 and 1623, conclude the Appendix.

An index of sources exhibits the works that have been used in the preparation of the volume, and a general index refers to subjects, persons and places. The footnotes, which are found on nearly every page, prove the original character of the work done by the authors and, at the same time, throw light on the narrative. The arrangement of the material and the style of composition are admirable and show the hand of a master.

It is not our purpose to criticize the contents. We should not consider ourselves able to dispute the positions taken by the author. We simply desire to express our appreciation of the excellencies of the work.

In the first two books, the general condition—social, intellectual and moral—of England in the fifteenth century, is described. In discussing Protestantism, the author limits himself to that portion which leads up to the Pilgrims. His object is "to determine the relation of the Pilgrim to that ethical and ecclesiastical past which was behind them and of which they were the logical and theological outgrowth. To do this it is mainly needful to note the progress of religious thought in England and the Low Countries." The treatment of the origin of the Pilgrim Church in Scrooby, and the conflicts through which the Pilgrims passed in England, is worthy of special commendation. Each page contains new material, and the conclusions of the author are evidently based on a knowledge of the sources. Perhaps the most valuable part of the book is that which treats of the Pilgrims in Amsterdam and in Leyden; their relation to the Church of Holland, to the Baptists and the Arminians, and their final determination to seek refuge in America. All these questions are discussed in detail and with numerous quotations from sources old and new.

American historians, who are acquainted with the works of Dr. Dexter, will not need to be urged to procure this volume. Those who are interested in the study of Church history in this country cannot do without it. It ought to have a place in every library. It should be studied by the ministers of all churches and by the intelligent laymen. It is one of the few works that will stand the test of time and will be consulted many years after its publication.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.



THE PROGRESS OF HELLENISM IN ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE. By John Pentland Mahaffy, C.V.O., D.D., D.C.L. (sometime Professor of Ancient History in the University of Dublin). Pages 149. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ills., 1905. Price \$1.00 net.

One of the interesting problems in the history of the early Church is the influence of Greek thought, religion, and life on the development of Christianity. This comparatively small volume throws light on that question. It contains a series of six lectures, which were delivered in the University of Chicago. In the Preface the author defines his purpose to be the giving of an accurate survey of Greek culture and of its spread over the East. The various elements in the environment of early Christianity are traced in a strictly historical manner. Such a compendium would have little value if written by a novice, who simply made extracts from larger books on the subject; but when it comes from the hand of Dr. Mahaffy, toward the close of his literary life rather than at its beginning, the work will command the respect even of specialists. The author has written more than one-half dozen volumes in Greek subjects, and prepared himself in this way for this course of lectures. The following topics are discussed: Xenophon, the Precursor of Hellenism; Macedonia and Greece; Egypt; Syria; General Reflections on Hellenism; Hellenistic Influences on Christianity.

The evidences of Greek culture are shown in the literature, the art, the social and mercantile life of the Orient. With his extensive knowledge of the sources, the writer is able to distinguish Grecian from native elements by apt illustrations and a citation of salient characteristics. In the concluding lecture he shows how the Hellenistic elements have been introduced into the Christian system. For example he says: "I contend, therefore, that the peculiar modernness, the high intellectual standard of Christianity, as we find it in the New Testament, is caused by its contact with Greek culture. It would be strange indeed if such contact had not shown itself in the form of Christian Doctrines, in Christian ways of approaching the great mysteries of life. Is it likely that the Christian teachers could adopt the tongue and the dialectic of Plato and not agree with him in the great intellectual and moral struggle against false views of the world and false theories of conduct? Is it likely that the Christian system would not profit by the Attic Moses as well as by the Hebrew law-giver?"

He not only finds Greek influence in speculative theology, but also in moral ideals. He finds a close correspondence between the stoic ethics and that of Paul. If the latter did not adopt his moral principles from the stoics, we must concede that the truth

was revealed to the Greeks independently of the teaching of St. Paul. He claims that the mysteries, celebrated yearly in the different parts of Greece and later throughout the empire, not only had a benign effect upon Greek life but helped to mold the forms of Christian worship.

The author is careful in his statements and in our judgment does not, as some writers are inclined to do at present, overdraw the relation between Hellenism and Christianity. Those who will read the book will find it stimulating, and will doubtless have a desire to make a more extended study of this subject.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL, 1780-1905.** The Official Report of the Eleventh International Sunday-school Convention, Toronto, Canada, June 23-27, 1905. Pages 712. Boston, Mass., published by The Executive Committee of the International Sunday-school Association, 1905. Price \$1.00.

This volume is more than a report of the proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Sunday-school Convention. It contains a history of the Sunday-school from 1780, the time of its origin under Robert Raikes, to 1905, the meeting of the Convention at Toronto. In the historical section, covering 113 pages, three parts are discussed: Part I.: The Sunday-school, in which part there are four articles on the following topics: Robert Raikes, and The Eighteenth Century, by George R. Merrill, D.D.; The Nineteenth Century Sunday-school, by Charles Trumbull; Organized Primary Work, by Mrs. J. W. Barnes; and From Our Muster Roll of Heroes, by Henry C. McCook.

Part II.: The Genesis of the International Sunday-school Lesson, by Professor H. M. Hamill; The Lesson Committee at Work, by John Potts; A List of the International Lessons, 1872-1906; The Beginner's Course, by Mrs. J. W. Barnes; Advanced Course of Lessons, by Professor John R. Sampey; Another Lesson Course of the Period.

Part III.: The Sunday-School Conventions, by W. C. Pierce; The First Sunday-Schools Organized in North America; The Best Spelling Book on Earth; National and International Conventions, by M. C. Hazard; Progress and Prophecy, by C. R. Blackall; From Milan to Jerusalem, by Edward K. Warren.

From this outline the reader will at once see that the historical portion of the book is of special value. It is prepared by specialists on the subjects treated and presents a summary of the modern Sunday-School movement.

In divisions II. and III. we have a report of the addresses delivered before the convention. The general topics which were discussed by representative men from Canada, the United States, and other sections of the globe, are the following: Some Relationships of the Sunday-School; The Relation of the Sunday-School to Education; The Relation of the Sunday-School to Evangelism; The Relation of the Sunday-School to Missions; The Relation of the Sunday-School to Denominational Work; Organization and Methods.

A report is given also of the Afternoon Conferences which were held in the different churches of the city. A series of tables and appendices are found at the close of the volume, containing Sunday-School statistics relating to the Sunday-Schools of the world. A list of delegates is given and the official program is printed in full. An extended index will enable the reader to refer readily to the material presented on nearly every phase of Sunday-School work.

Cuts of the men who had part in the program, as well as of the members of the Lesson Committee since 1872, add interest to the book. Instructive scenes of Palestine and Bible lands are also presented. It is one of the most valuable reports that has yet been published in this series. We commend it to all Sunday-School workers.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**THE CORRECTED ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.** A Revision of the Authorized Version (by Nestle's Resultant Text). Prepared with the assistance of eminent scholars, and issued by Samuel Lloyd, with Preface by the Bishop of Durham. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. Price \$1.50.

"The Corrected English New Testament" (with Preface by the Bishop of Durham) will be published shortly in London by S. Bagster & Sons, Limited, and in New York by G. P. Putnam's Sons. This work has been undertaken in the belief that it is possible to present a close translation of the Scriptures in English thoroughly readable and everywhere intelligible, and that a rendering, which as the Bishop of Durham says of this Version, "aims to preserve to the utmost the noble general form of the Authorized Version," is likely to prove more acceptable to the majority of English readers than a professedly modernized translation can be. The promoter is Mr. Samuel Lloyd, of Birmingham, who is a Life Governor of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and he has dedicated the work as a memorial of the Society's Centenary. By carefully avoiding the Graecisms and the faulty English constructions which, here and there, mar the beauty and detract from the clearness both of the Authorized

and of the Revised Versions, the translators have endeavored to produce a version essentially English. The work has been edited by literary experts in constant consultation with competent students of the Greek text, and no rendering has been adopted which is not supported by the highest authorities. Many eminent scholars have contributed advice and assistance as the result of a private circulation of two tentative editions. Among those by whom assistance was given at different stages of the work were the Rev. Canon Girdlestone, M.A., Dr. Rendel Harris, the Rev. E. Hampden-Cook (editor of Dr. Weymouth's "New Testament in Modern Speech"), the Rev. A. H. T. Clarke, the Rev. E. P. Boys Smith, and other well-known scholars.

During the final revision the English editors have worked in consultation with the Rev. E. E. Cunningham, M.A., of Llangarcon, Herefordshire, who, besides being well qualified as a translator, has made a special study of English. In this revision, every passage has been carefully reconsidered, or, when necessary, rewritten, in order to ensure the text being, as far as possible, thoroughly intelligible to every reader. But no alteration of the English, however small, has been made without renewed reference to the Greek.

The text followed is that of Dr. Eberhard Nestle's Greek Testament, the fourth edition of which, as one of the Centenary publications of the Bible Society, has been everywhere welcomed by Bible students.

"The Corrected English New Testament" is the first complete translation into English from this valuable text—a resultant of the recensions of Tischendorf, Wescott & Hort, and Weiss. It is believed that the special attention given to the English of this version will give the reader a clearer view of the meaning, and a higher appreciation of the literary qualities of the original. The work is designed to point the way to methods of revision which may be the means of popularizing the study of the Bible not only among religious readers, but among those who find little attractiveness in the current versions. The Bishop of Durham (in the Preface) speaks of this version as showing a consciousness of the importance of good construing, while the translators "on the other hand have never forgotten that to construe is not always to translate." After commenting on the lack of "English felicity" in the Revised Version, the Bishop adds, "That defect the 'Corrected English New Testament,' in countless instances, appears to me to remedy."

Marginal references (many of them original) are given, and the aims and methods of the revision are fully explained in the Introduction.

**LUTHER'S CHURCH POSTIL GOSPELS:** Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany Sermons, Vol. I.; and Gospels: Thirteenth to Twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity, Vol. V. Translated for the first time into English, with Introduction, Walch's Analyses and Bugenhagen's "Summaries." By Professor John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Pages 455 and pages 395, duodecimo, cloth. Minneapolis, Minn., Lutherans in All Lands Co. Price \$2.25 per volume.

We have called attention in the REVIEW, July, 1905, to the series of "The Precious and Sacred Writings of Martin Luther," translated by Professor Lenker into English. These two volumes of Gospel sermons belong to the series and like Vol. IV. reflect credit upon the translator, increase interest in the preaching of the hero of the Reformation, and convince the reader of the greatness of the service the publisher is rendering the English-speaking world. Volume I. is dedicated to the memory of Bartholomew Ziegenbalg, who was the first to carry the Gospel from Europe back to Asia, sailing from Copenhagen, Denmark, November 29, 1705, and landing at Tranquebar, India, July 9, 1706. It is evident from this fact that the beginning of the modern missionary movement is not found in England at the close of the eighteenth century, but is traceable to the continent in the opening of the eighteenth century—a fact so often overlooked by American students of foreign missions. Volume V. contains in the introduction a number of tributes of scholars to Luther's writings. These admirers of the Saxon reformer are found in every generation since his death, among all denominations in all lands. Luther does not belong to a class nor a branch in protestantism. He belongs to evangelical Christianity. In the appendix are a series of comparative statistics on Teutonic and Latin Culture, President Roosevelt's Speech on the Lutheran Church, delivered at the re-dedication exercises in the Luther Place Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, January 29, 1905, and Ecumenical Lutheran Statistics, 1905. These are valuable additions to the book and will be useful for reference to the student of general and Lutheran Church history.

We need not enter into a discussion of the merits of the sermons themselves. That would be presumptuous. They are recognized classics and should at least be tasted by every English preacher. The translation, with its clear-cut Anglo-Saxon words and direct sentences, brings out the lucidity and the vigor of the original. It is natural that the publisher is an enthusiastic admirer of Luther, and one feels in reading prefaces and notes that he is in danger of magnifying the Reformer, if not beyond his deserts, at least beyond his own desires. To his credit we recall his words on this point. "Wie käme denn ich armer,

stinkender Madensack dazu, dass Man die Kinder Christi sollt mit meinem heillosen Namen nennen?" His modesty some of his followers do not emulate.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**JESUS CHRIST AND THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.** By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. Pages 304. New York, The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.50 net.

Several years ago, in 1900, the author of this book published "Jesus Christ and the Social Question." In the volume before us the discussion does not turn immediately upon the social question, it turns on the deeper theme of character, which, of course, has a fundamental relation to all the problems that are usually brought before us under the head of the social question. In the introductory chapter the author discusses the condition of the modern world and the tendencies of thought and activity in the present age. Among the many questions which come up for discussion to-day the social question is easily the most prominent. In the same way, within the borders of the Christian Church, the predominating interest to-day is not doctrine, but practice. Stress is laid upon life and character, and Christianity must stand or fall with the fruits which it bears in the latter aspect. If character, then, is fundamental, and Christianity is to be measured by its influence upon character, it becomes of supreme importance to inquire first of all into the character of Jesus Christ Himself, the Founder of Christianity and the Source of all the inspiration and power and life that are involved in Christianity.

Starting, in the second chapter, with the statement that the Christian character is the consequence of the imitation of Christ, the author goes on to say what imitation means. "A rational imitation of Christ is not the conduct of a mimic or a puppet. It means what the imitation of other characters means,—an influence of leadership, power, authority and example applied to the conditions of one's own life. The traits in him which command appreciation are applied, not to suppress one's own character, but to enrich and ennoble it. Jesus comes not to destroy, but to fulfil. If any man will come after him, let him take up his own burden, his own cross, his own experience and follow." Perhaps this statement is a little vague. We take it that the influence of Christ in the molding of character means more than mere leadership, power, authority and example on the part of Christ as these things would come from any great man. Here, no doubt, the crucial question of faith and the inner working of the Holy Spirit should come to view. But we follow the author's argument and implicitly accept his statement that the influence



of Christ again proceeds only from his own personality, and that it is, therefore, of prime importance that we should have a true conception of the character of Christ in order to see the source of His influence and power. The second chapter, then, is devoted to a study of the character of Christ as drawn from the gospels, and it is put before us with consummate skill. The lines are delicately drawn and the picture stands out in all the grace and beauty and strength of a perfect personality. The fundamental characteristic is that of power and authority. This expresses itself first in the way of sympathy and self-impartation and then again in the way of isolation and reserve, or in what the author calls "spiritual solitude." "The crowd presses round Him and He serves them gladly and then it seems as if His nature demanded solitude for the refreshment of His faith. The tide of the Spirit ebbs from Him in the throng, and when He goes apart He is least alone because the Father is with Him. Then from utterance to silence, from giving to receiving, from society to solitude the rhythm of His nature moves; and the power which is spent in service is renewed in isolation. He is able to bear the crosses of others because He bears His own. He can be of use to man because he can do without man. He is ethically effective because He is spiritually free. He is able to save because He is able to suffer. His sympathy and solitude are both alike the instruments of His strength."

In the third chapter the author discusses the roots of the Christian character, that is the beginning of the spiritual life in man, the sources from which this development proceeds. To find these we must turn to the teaching of Jesus Christ, and in doing this two errors are to be avoided, namely, the error of the casuist who turns to the gospel to find ethical prescriptions applicable to specific ills, and that of the dogmatist who goes to the gospels to find a body of doctrine, and looks upon the Christian character as a consequence of the Christian creed. But, what was it that commended itself especially to the mind of Jesus? Upon what did He lay the seal of His approval, and what did He condemn as hurtful to the development of the Christian life? Christian character is a growth. You have first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. The starting point in this process of growth, according to the author, is the principle of teachableness or humility. The greatest obstacle is a self-satisfied righteousness like that of the scribes and Pharisees. The two things necessary, then, are, first, humility and, secondly, self-respect. The spiritual life begins neither in the reason nor in the emotions, but in the will. The first step toward safety is in the decision to proceed. The first question asked is: On which side?



No man can serve two masters. Neutrality is iniquity. The first step being taken, the second follows. "After obedience comes insight. First decision, then precision. First the following of Jesus, and later the understanding of Him,—such is the sequence of Christian experience."

In the fourth chapter the growth of Christian character is described. Beginning, as all life does, in a germ there is a gradual unfolding of the Christian character until it stands before us as to reveal its essential attributes. These attributes are expressed by three words the meaning of which is put before us with graphic power. The first is Righteousness, representing especially the prevailing tone of ethical teaching in the first three gospels; the second is Love which enters like a new *motif* into the music of life and recalls the more intimate utterances of Jesus Himself; the third is Life which is the peculiar characteristic of the fourth gospel. The combination of these three characteristics produces that sense of power and authority which was especially noticeable in the life of Jesus Christ Himself, and makes itself felt in every human personality that is fully pervaded by the spirit of the Master.

In the fifth and sixth chapters the personal and social consequences of the Christian character are brought under discussion, and it is here especially that the saneness and practical aspect of Christianity as a power in the transformation of the world come to view. The principles which underlie the Christian life in this manifestation involve something of a paradox, namely, self-realization through self-surrender, or the finding of life through the losing of it. The Greek ideal of a harmonious and symmetrical nature sets before us the law of self-realization. On the other hand, we are taught that self-denial and sacrifice are the means by which the ideals of life can be realized. The author insists that these different aspects of life must be combined and that self-realization, in the strict sense of the word, is possible only through a life of service and self-sacrifice.

The last two chapters are on the Ascent of Ethics and the Descent of Faith. Morality, if it begins in the true spirit, must lead up to faith. Progress in morality is, "as though one's way led over a series of stepping-stones each of which was firm, but beneath it ran an unexplored and mysterious stream. Beneath the question of Ethics often, when these are answered, run deeper questions of religion, showing every source which lies back of ethics and flowing to an end which is beyond ethics." On the other hand, religion, a life on the heights in fellowship with God, a life of faith, must, in the nature of the case, lead downward into all the avenues of our human life and become active in the

world as a power that makes for righteousness. "Ethics remains tentative and preliminary until it fulfils itself in faith. Religion remains empty and abstract until it dedicates itself to service. The test of religion is neither the height it gains nor the view it surveys, but the strength with which it descends. There is no Christian religion which is not an applied religion. The sanctified life is the serviceable life and in that service finds its freedom."

This outline of the author's argument gives but a faint idea of the richness of the volume. The style is charming, the treatment clear and logical, and the whole presentation of the subject is both eloquent and beautiful. The book may be safely recommended to all who have any interest in ethics or religion.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**ESSAYS IN PURITANISM.** By Andrew Macphail. Pages 340. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Price \$1.50 net.

"The five essays contained in this book were read before a company of artists who had the traditional antipathy of their class toward the spirit of Puritanism." So says the author in his prefatory note. The subjects of the essays are Jonathan Edwards, John Winthrop, Margaret Fuller, Walt Whitman, John Wesley. The essays themselves are of unequal merit, due, no doubt, to the varying degrees of ability on the part of the author to enter into the spirit of his subject. They all contain a good deal of interesting matter and some points in the life and character of the subjects are brought out with striking force. One cannot read what the author has to say of Margaret Fuller or Walt Whitman or John Wesley without getting a deeper insight into their aspirations and the work which they accomplished or attempted to accomplish in the world. Sometimes the touches seem light and trifling; then again there is a streak of humor or satire; there are not wanting strong graphic pictures of the times and the conditions in which the lot of these characters was cast. The strength and the weakness, especially of Margaret Fuller and Walt Whitman are well set forth and the author's judgment in these cases may be considered fair and just. The sketch of John Wesley is even more appreciative and it will no doubt be read with interest.

The least satisfactory portion of the book is found in the first two essays, on Jonathan Edwards and John Winthrop. The latter, indeed, receives a great deal of credit, and the author evidently has great admiration for his character and ability. Indeed there is not wanting, here, an overestimation of Winthrop's influence as if it molded the whole history of the United States

and gave tone and character to the government established by and for the country after the Revolutionary War. For instance, the author seems to take for granted that Winthrop's separation of the magistrates and deputies into two houses in the government of the Massachusetts Colony, in 1644, was the foundation of the government of the United States. We think there are other ways of accounting for the bicameral system of the United States. The great defect in both essays is the inability of the author to see the seriousness of the problem with which the men of those days had to deal. He sees very well that they took it seriously, but for him religion is not a serious problem. He does not, indeed, wave religion aside altogether, but the aspect of religion which confronted theology in the struggles of those days, does not appeal to him. In a light, flippant tone he discourses upon their attitude. He can see the somber quality of the religion and the stern, harsh influence of the theology of Jonathan Edwards; but there is no evidence that he appreciates the greatness and intellectual ability and the far reaching influence of Jonathan Edwards, or, for that matter, of John Winthrop, except as the latter shows wisdom and moderation and gentleness in spite of the tenets of his faith. It is easy to see and to criticise these features of the system of Jonathan Edwards because there is room for criticism, but surely there is another side to the subject; and there ought to be something better to say of the man who stands out as one of the greatest minds this country has produced, and who wielded so tremendous an influence in molding the character of the sons of New England. It is not necessary to accept the stern tenets of this faith, and there is, no doubt, a revolt from the extreme positions to which the theology of Jonathan Edwards led him; but to do justice to the man and to his theological systems, it is necessary to bear in mind the point of view from which the subject was approach at that time. The sovereignty of God is of profound significance and the relation between it and the human will, as every student of church history knows, is one which the human mind, believing in God and having a keen sense of justice and the difference between love and wrath, between sin and righteousness, cannot lightly wave aside. Of all this the author seems to have no conception and, of course, his estimate of the character of his subjects is so far forth defective.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**MY LITTLE BOOK OF PRAYER.** By Meuriel Strobe. Pages 78. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company.

This is a dainty little volume, but we should hardly call it a book of prayer. It is rather a series of short meditations sometimes in the form of a prayer or wish, sometimes in the form of a

categorical statement. The dominant note is that of self-sufficiency and confidence in one's own powers in the experience of joy and sorrow, and all the vicissitudes of life, which, to our mind, is not exactly the attitude of prayer. There is, however, a good deal of philosophy in some of the meditations, and, as this is the second edition, the book must have attracted some attention.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**THE NUMERICAL STRUCTURE OF SCRIPTURE.** By F. W. Grant. Pages 155. New York, Loizeaux Brothers, 63 Fourth Ave. Price 75 cents, bound.

The purport of the argument contained in this book is manifest in the sub-title: "A seal upon its perfect inspiration, and a divinely given help to its right interpretation." It consists of a series of lectures in which the author not only tries to explain the symbolism of the numbers of the Bible, but also to show that the whole basis of scripture, the order and arrangement of the various books, and the interpretation of its message are to be found in the numerical plan which, by divine inspiration, is unfolded in it. A great deal of ingenuity is exercised in making all the parts of the plan fit together, so that one cannot help thinking of Ignatius Donnelly's "discovery" of the cryptograms in Shakspeare which are supposed to prove the Baconian authorship of great English dramas. The process, however, appears exceedingly mechanical, and runs counter to all modern theories of inspiration.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**THE FREEDOM OF AUTHORITY: Essays in Apologetics.** By J. Macbride Sterrett, D.D., the Head Professor of Philosophy in the George Washington University. Pages 319. New York, Macmillan Company, 1905. Price \$2.00.

Professor Sterrett has previously distinguished himself by his expositions of "Hegel's Philosophy of Religion" and the "Ethics of Hegel." He stands for the authority of the Church as historically developed, and specifically, for the standards set forth in the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

The larger part, two-thirds, of this, his latest book, is composed of four new essays entitled "The Freedom of Authority," "Sabatier and Harnack," "Loisy," and "The Historical Method." There are four other briefer essays which are mainly reproductions of previously published articles.

The text of the first essay is Emerson's dictum: "Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist." In reply the author well says: "Nonconformity is often the highest type of moral and

religious conformity." He develops fully the familiar thought that the highest freedom can be attained only through submission to the highest authority. The negative element of dissent and protest is interpreted in typical Hegelian style as being not an alien force but an immanent movement of life, a necessary step from a lower to a higher stage of thought.

There follows a keen criticism of Sabatier's *Religion of the Spirit* and Harnack's *Essence of Christianity*, which systems are in the author's view fittingly characterized by the words, "immediacy, pectoralism, subjectivity." When Harnack declares that Roman Catholicism has nothing to do with the Gospel he shows the lack of the historical spirit: "The greatest historical institution of the world is not significant of God in history." This is fierce and telling criticism. The author goes so far as to say: "The subjective religion that Jesus had was not Christianity. Historically his personal religion was the Jewish religion." He says at another place: "I mean by religion, not the subjective feeling in the heart, but an objective, historical, concrete form of human activity." It appears from all this that Professor Sterrett is so anxious to stand up straight that he leans over backward. His view of religion is no less one-sided than that which he attributes to Sabatier and Harnack. Finally he repudiates what he calls their Neo-Kantian agnosticism. "We must either simply live the Christian life and abstain from any attempt at intellectual justification of it, or we must transcend the agnosticism that makes any such justification impossible. Sabatier and Harnack have done neither." This is the best chapter in the book.

The next chapter reviews the untranslated work of Abbe Loisy on the Gospel and the Church, a polemic directed against Protestantism as represented, or misrepresented, by Sabatier and Harnack. In general Loisy stands for Newman's theory of development. In regard to the facts of the life of Jesus and the history of the early Church his criticism is no less destructive than that of Sabatier and Harnack. For him Christianity is the presence of Christ in the historical Church. His appeal is to the communal faith rather than to that of the individual. Naturally Professor Sterrett sympathizes with Loisy in this contention. But he has reason to feel suspicious of the thesis that the mind of the Church is the mind of Christ, which uncomfortably reminds him of Feuerbach's theory of religion as the self-deification of man. "Religion," he justly says, "cannot thrive on a known fable, however pious it may be." On one point our author, perhaps unconsciously, agrees with the Ritschlians. He

mistrusts mysticism: "I find that Christian mysticism is not a merely subjective product, but that, historically, it has always been born and nurtured within the folds of the Church—Roman or other." "It is like the pearl that is no part of a healthy oyster."

The chapter on the historical method is an insistent polemic against the false metaphysics of naturalism, with reference especially to the reality and supremacy of final causes. The unspiritual, mechanical, theory of historical development which "has escorted the Creator to the extreme frontier of the universe, with many expressions of consideration, and returned without Him" is shown to be the cause of the lack of interest and confidence in the results of history. "The enthusiasm for the historical method is primarily optimistic."

The reprinted essays do not add materially to the strength of the book. That on the "Ethics of Creed Conformity" is vague and unsatisfying. In the last chapter on the "Ultimate Ground of Authority" the reader is confronted once more with that superlatively audacious Hegelian theory of the Trinity.

Professor Sterrett writes with enthusiastic abandon and Carlylean disregard of the stereotyped forms of speech. For such a word as "reification" there is place in theological terminology. But such expressions as "disconscious themselves" and "outer itself" are too disconcerting to be useful. At times plays on words are too much in evidence. There are wearisome reiterations in certain parts that make the book hard to read. But on other pages there are brilliant discussions and suggestions that abundantly reward the patient reader.

The general message of the book, which is very much like that of Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism," is highly appreciated by the Reformed Church. But Ritschlianism too has a valid message. We must learn to do justice to the psychological aspect of religion and so get a criterion for distinguishing what is abnormal from what is normal in the development of dogma, that is, for a scientific delimitation of the authority of the Church. It will not do to trace the objective development and then in a supplementary, incidental, way discuss the "psychological forms of religion" as Professor Sterrett does. Such a system of thought is implicit Romanism. Professing to exalt the dogma by declaring its absolute authority it really denies its significance by sundering it from vital piety.

Minor typographical errors abound. In this respect the volume is not quite worthy of the publishers whose imprint it bears.

CHRISTOPHER NOSS.



**THE PROPHETS AND THE PROMISE**, being for substance the Lectures for 1902-1903 on the L. P. Stone Foundation in the Princeton Theological Seminary. By Rev. Willis Judson Beecher, D.D., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Theological Seminary of Auburn in the State of New York. New York, Thomas V. Crowell and Company, Publishers. Price \$2.00 net.

This is a new work on an old theme,—a theme, however, of which we never weary. The prophets of Israel are the glory of their nation. The longer we view them in their true character and the more closely we study the writings they have left us, the more we admire the grand rôle they played in the history of religion, the hope they cherished and the promise they gave of a future Messiah, and their unceasing labors to prepare the way for the realization of this hope and the fulfillment of the promise in the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is not surprising that, throughout the Christian centuries, they have been studied with increasing interest, and never more so than to-day. We might think that all that could be known of them is already known. Yet with the progress of biblical science new points of view appear and new questions arise. In this field, so long and so diligently cultivated, we may well believe there is yet much truth to be gleaned.

With this hope Dr. Beecher has set himself the task of studying the prophets anew. Standing as he does among the ablest and best-known biblical scholars of America, he is well qualified by his learning, his reverent spirit and his many years of labor spent in searching the Scriptures for the work he has taken in hand. A mere glance into his book shows that he is an earnest seeker after truth and a careful, painstaking workman. This naturally awakens great expectations which are strengthened when we read the preliminary chapter. He expresses himself as dissatisfied both with the older and with the newer treatments of the prophets. He is neither an unyielding conservative unwilling to make any concessions that conflict with untenable traditions, nor yet a radical critic who would reconstruct the Old Testament according to his subjective fancies. Statements of fact, he justly says, "are to be provisionally accepted unless there are substantial reasons for not accepting them." It is necessary, however, he tells us, to ascertain the true meaning of such statements in the form in which they have come down to us, as preliminary to testing the truth of them, and either accepting or rejecting them. We must come to an Old Testament passage with the question: "What did this mean to an intelligent, devout, un-inspired Israelite of the time to which it belongs?" One may not make a doctrine of inspiration, he further says, a presupposition



to the historical study of the prophets, nor can one be justified in an indiscriminating rejection of the statements concerning them. Waiving all questions of inspiration, we should "treat our sources merely as literature that has come down to us from a remote past"; and if statements of fact are contradictory, or contrary to known truth, they may not be accepted.

These principles of historical interpretation every modern critic adopts; and if they are rightly applied, they should lead biblical inquirers to practically the same results.

But much to our surprise and disappointment, we have here the old traditional view of the prophets with some modifications that do not seriously affect the truth. This the author candidly admits. He tells us in his preface that his presentation of the subject "is essentially a restatement of the Christian tradition that was supreme fifty years ago," though in Dr. Beecher's eyes, the differences between the older view and the new view he presents are "so numerous and important, that it will probably be regarded by men who do not think things through, as an attack on that tradition."

Of course the author does not hold the belief of earlier generations, which is still popularly very common, that "the prophets were mere givers of oracles and predictors of the future." "A prophet is not characteristically a person who foretells, but one who speaks forth a message from Deity." "Prophecy and prediction are different terms." "In bulk, predictions constitute but a small part, and what predictions there are consist almost entirely of promises and threats." Nor is a prophet, according to Dr. Beecher, simply a passive organ of the Spirit of God. "The Bible refuses to present any other picture of a prophet than that of a citizen like other citizens, holding a commission from God, and endowed with the gifts requisite for accrediting his commission." In the Scriptures as they stand, leaving out the exceptional instances that serve to emphasize the rule, our attention is withdrawn from external marks, and fixed upon the personal man or woman whom God has appointed to be a prophet."

These and like modifications are important, but they do not essentially affect the traditional theory in general. Dr. Beecher's conclusions will not commend themselves to the large body of professional biblical scholars. Why? Not from lack of ability, or learning, or desire on his part to reach the truth, but through his failure (unintentional, of course) rightly to apply the method of investigation now regarded as the true method. Modern criticism employs the same method in the study of the Bible, which science has employed with such marvelous results in the study of nature. It collects the facts, if possible all the facts, bearing on

the subject of investigation, examines them from every point of view to ascertain what they really mean in themselves, studies with the utmost care their mutual relations of identity or difference, and only then draws the inferences which the facts, so interpreted and compared, naturally suggest. The facts come first, then the theory based on the facts. No tradition, no assumption, apart from the facts, may be allowed to control the interpretation of the facts.

It is just here, we think, the author has failed. He is not true to the scientific method which, from his preliminary chapter, we had reason to expect him to employ. Unconsciously he reads the biblical facts in the light of extra-biblical tradition. It will be sufficient to call attention to a single instance.

One has but to follow him through the chapter on "The External History of the Prophets" to see that, in his view, the name prophet (*nābhī'*) has substantially the same meanings in all ages of the world, from the time of Abraham and before, through the long roll down to the post-exilic period, when "the succession of the prophets ceased with the dying out of Nehemiah and his associates, about 400 B. C." He tells us that "the prominent characteristics [of the prophets] are the same in all dates in the history, however the prophets of the different periods may differ in matters of detail."

Does this statement accord with the real facts? What the early "prophets" were in the time of Saul is clear from 1 Samuel 10: 5, 6. They were men who were violently seized by the divine spirit and thrown into a state of ecstasy, which was either, as here, intensified by music and song, or induced by it, as in the case of Elisha (2 Kings 3: 15). Wrought up into wild enthusiasm, they became frenzied, and in this state "prophesied." The verb rendered "prophecy" (*hithnabbé'*, or oftener *nibbā'*, the reflexive forms *Hithpael* and *Niphal*) is a denominative derived from *nābhī'*, and signifies "to show oneself a 'prophet'" (*nābhī'*). What that meant in the days of Saul is evident from 1 Samuel 18: 10, 11, where, when the evil spirit from God came upon Saul, he "prophesied," i. e., raved, and in his madness hurled a javelin at David. Indeed, in 2 Kings 9:11; Numbers 9: 7; Jeremiah 29: 26, "prophet" (*nābhī'*) and madman (*mēshuggā'*) denote one and the same person. The name *nābhī'* is of uncertain etymology; but in any case when employed in early Israel down to at least the ninth century, it denotes one in a sacred frenzy, whose excited utterances and wild manner give the impression of a person more or less demented. When Saul was in pursuit of David in Ramah, the Spirit of God came upon him also, as upon the three messengers whom he had before sent,

and stripping off his clothes also, he "prophesied" before Samuei in like manner and lay down naked all that day and all that night (1 Samuel 19: 23, 24). In view of these facts it will not do to say with Dr. Beecher: "We need not necessarily figure this as a company of dancing dervishes. It may equally well be a band of serious men, holding an outdoor religious meeting with a procession, and music and public speeches." But would any one, if he found such stories outside of the Old Testament, interpret them otherwise than as manifestations of frenzied men?

Similar phenomena are encountered in various religions from ancient times to the present day. Baal had his "prophets" who bear the same name as the Israelite "prophets" in the time of Saul, and behave in a still more mad and orgiastic way. In the great contest between Yahweh and Baal at Mt. Carmel, Elijah summoned 450 of Baal's "prophets" who, wildly limping about the altar, called on Baal from morning even until noon; and when at noon Elijah mocked them, they cried aloud, cutting themselves after their manner with swords and lances until the blood gushed out upon them; and when midday was passed they "prophesied" until the evening oblation was offered. What was the nature of their prophesying? Was it the delivery of discourses like those of Amos and Isaiah? Assuredly not. In the circumstances it could consist of nothing else than the frantic utterances and wild acts proceeding from a state of the highest ecstasy.

These "prophets" of Saul's time are so unlike the prophets of the eighth century and onwards whom we know from their writings, that we may well ask what end they served. This is not definitely stated, but may easily be inferred from what we know of the historical situation at the time of their appearance. Their aim was at once national and religious. The nation groaned under the Philistine yoke. It was filled with a sense of shame for Yahweh's defeat and with indignation against its heathen foe. The time for action had come. Then there arose men inspired with enthusiasm for the God of Israel. Preceded by lyre and tambourine, flute and harp, they went in bands from place to place, arousing the people to fight the battles of Yahweh against the Philistine hosts. Their enthusiasm, heightened by rude music, kindled enthusiasm and hope in the popular heart; the tribes became more closely united against their common enemy; and the armies of Israel, with Yahweh as their leader, achieved complete victory over their heathen oppressor.

How entirely different from these early "prophets" are the so-called *writing prophets*, who do not appear until toward the middle of the eighth century. We do not wonder that Amos, the

first of this new order, strongly disclaims being "a prophet, or the son of a prophet" after the older type. The name is the same, but its signification has become wholly changed. The grotesque features which characterized the "prophets" of the days of Samuel and Saul have disappeared. They are still seen two centuries later in the "prophets" of Baal, so numerous in the time of Ahab, but no longer, at least to the same extent, in the "prophets" of Yahweh. Yet even Elijah and Elisha cannot be placed on the same high moral plane as Amos and his successors. They interfered in the affairs of state, not hesitating to resort to violence for the accomplishment of their ends. Elijah slew the 450 prophets of Baal at the brook Kishon (1 Kings 18: 40). Elisha sent one of the sons of the prophets, that is, a member of a prophetic guild, to anoint Jehu king over Israel, thus overthrowing one dynasty and setting up another (2 Kings, ch. 9). Nothing like this is witnessed in the literary prophets of the eighth century and later. They too were politicians, but politicians who viewed the affairs of the nation from a divine standpoint. Their interest lay in the righteousness of the nation, and they used only moral means to secure their purpose. They simply proclaimed, in the face of all opposition, the Word of Yahweh.

Dr. Beecher's book, in spite of its defects, is yet full of interest. It can be read with much profit even by those who differ with him. One thing is especially noticeable and worthy of all praise: he is always respectful to his opponents, and his opponents cannot fail to respect him. This, we regret to say, is not always true of those who contend against the so-called higher criticism.

F. A. GAST.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF PALESTINE EXPLORATION.** Being the Ely Lectures for 1903. By Frederick Jones Bliss, Ph.D., author of "A Mound of Many Cities," "Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-1897," etc. 12mo., pages xvii + 337. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906. Price \$1.50 net.

This volume presents a series of eight lectures, delivered before the Union Theological Seminary by an alumnus in 1903 on the Ely Foundation, "with considerable amplification and one modification."

The scope of the lectures is general. Chronologically they cover a period of c. 4000 years, or from the Egyptian Papyrus which goes under the name of the Romance of Sinuhit, dating from the time of Useratesen I., c. 1966 B. C., to the modern "Schools" of Exploration: "The Practical School of Biblical Studies" (French, 1890), with its Theological Faculty and its

important organ, the *Révue Biblique*, under the auspices of the Dominicans; "The American School of Oriental Study and Research in Palestine" (1900), supported by some twenty universities and seminaries in the United States; and the "German Evangelical Archæological Institute" (1902). All these schools in Jerusalem were preceded by the Palestine Exploration Fund. Bibliographically the lectures cover an equally immense field which impresses itself all the more when one recalls that Röhrich's *Bibliotheca Geographica Palæstina* contains 3,515 names of writers on Palestine, from A. D. 333 to 1878 alone. These writers were for the most part explorers, or at any rate for the most part actual travellers. Of course the lectures do not take up all this literature, but they present the result of a critical sifting.

In Lecture I., *The Dawn of Exploration*, the lecturer reminds us that in Palestine up to this time recovery has greatly outbalanced discovery; that the impelling motive of the vast majority of travellers to Palestine, from the time of Constantine to the present day, has been a desire there to find confirmation, illustration and expansion of the facts presented by the Bible. A series of references to the land and places in the land were given by the Bible, and the main object has been to identify these.

The character and scope of the geographical references contained in the Bible is considered and the reader is reminded of the great geographer Ritter's happy expression, "the contents of the biblical books are not to be considered as intentionally or directly geographical; they are so, as a general rule, only in a secondary sense."

Egyptian and Mesopotamian references to Syria and Palestine are passed over in rapid review, beginning with the Romance of Sinuhit, son of King Amenemhat I. In this romance the district of Eaa is pictured as rich in figs and vines, in olive-groves and cornfields, in wine and honey, where the prince feasted on boiled meat and roast goose. After this romance the Annals of Thothmes III., who became sole master of Egypt c. 1493 B. C., are considered. This first historical presentation in Egyptian sources is pictured on the walls of the temple of Amen at Karnak in Upper Egypt, and describes fourteen campaigns into Syria and Palestine. Of especial interest for the lecturer's purpose is the list of Princes of one hundred and nineteen towns of Upper Rutenu or Palestine, who, according to the inscription, are "shut up in the miserable town of Maketa (Megiddo)," the siege of which the Annals describe in detail. The North Syrian list of towns is even larger, numbering about 235. The Tell-Amarna correspondence contained in the 320 famous cuneiform tablets,

conducted about the fifteenth century B. C., during the reign of Amenhotep III. and Amenhotep IV. is then considered. Among the Palestinian towns from which letters or inscribed tablets were sent to Egypt appears Jerusalem. The lecturer himself, Dr. Bliss, found in the course of his excavations at Lachish in 1892 a letter belonging to the same general correspondence. In 1903 two more were found by Sellin at Taanach; Macalister in his excavations begun in 1902 at Abu Shusheh—the Biblical Gezer—also reports the discovery of two cuneiform tablets of the seventh century B. C. The Egyptian Papyrus dating from the time of Rameses II., usually referred to as the "Travels of a Mohar" is then noticed. The adventures of an Egyptian officer, travelling in a chariot from the vicinity of Aleppo to Megiddo and hence to Egypt *via* Joppa is described in this Papyrus. Of the thirty-eight places mentioned in Palestine proper about one-half are well-known biblical sites. There is still a later papyrus dealing with the visit of another Egyptian official to Syria, c. 1070 B. C., illustrating the state of the country before the days of Samuel and Saul. The lecturer now calls our attention to the Mesopotamian references to places in Syria and Palestine, but *geographically* this material is not as explicit as that of the Egyptian records. There is no exhaustive list of conquered places like that of Thothmes III., nor do we find here a description of the land comparable to the Travels of a Mohar. The Mesopotamian material furnishes, however, abundant information for tracing the advance of Assyrian power in the west, but its actual geographical information furnished in the records is meagre. The account of Sennacherib's third campaign, the one against Judah in the time of Hezekiah, the lecturer considers as the best specimen the Assyrian material can offer him for his purposes. Of this he presents a brief *résumé*. The rest of this first lecture is taken up with a consideration of the references of Greek, Roman and non-biblical writers to Syria and Palestine: Herodotus, Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, Tacitus, Josephus, *et al.*

In the three following lectures, The Age of Pilgrimage, The Crusaders and After, From Fabri to Robinson, the lecturer traces the course which the exploration of Palestine took during these centuries. During the first century before and the two centuries after the birth of Christ the geography of Syria and Palestine was treated by the Greeks and Romans with the best science of their day. In the Onomasticon of Eusebius († 340) and Jerome († 420) the subject of biblical geography reached such a lofty point as was not again attained for many centuries. From the Bordeaux Pilgrim whose journey was made 333 A. D.



to the monk Bernard, late in the ninth century western travellers to Palestine were impelled by no other motive than worship. The lack of information in regard to Syria and Palestine, from western sources, between the monk Bernard and the period of the Crusades, is abundantly compensated for by the wealth of material furnished by Arab and Persian historians and geographers: Istakhri, Ibn Haukal, Mukaddasi, Yakût, Abu-el-Fidâ, Ibn Batûtah, Jemal-ed-Din, Nasir-i-Khusrau, *et al.* The pre-Crusading pilgrims from the West care more for the marvels associated with a place than for the way leading to it, or for a strict proof of its authenticity; these dim-visioned pilgrims during the Middle Ages knew how to pray fervently, but see clearly they could not. Their spiritual descendants in countless hordes coming in from the steppes of Russia may even be seen in the land to-day, at each recurring year. During the century of the Latin kings not much change set in. Felix Fabri (1483) is characterized as the "first typical modern explorer." After Felix Fabri the area of exploration is gradually widening; not geographically, but in the sense of including more subjects. At the end of the sixteenth century archaeology, hitherto almost neglected, attracts Cotovicus, and toward the close of the seventeenth century it comes fairly to the front in the works of De la Roque and Maundrell. The natural history of the country is brought into prominence by Du Mans in the middle of the sixteenth century. Soon after him the pioneer scientific botanist, Rauwolf, appears. At the beginning of the eighteenth century appears an account of the various physical aspects of the country, while a few years later Hasselquist, the pupil of Linnæus, is in the country making collections in natural history. Geology has its representative in Rüssegger, a contemporary of Robinson.

In Lecture V. the work of Robinson, who "stands at the focal point where all the various lines converge" is taken up. Robinson's main energies were bent on the study of the physical and historical geography of Palestine. Identification was his keyword. Geology, natural history, folk-lore, and archeology are quite subordinate to him in his travels in the country. He was convinced that ecclesiastical tradition concerning the identification of Biblical sites was worthless, and that in the modern names lay the ancient nomenclature in fossil form, consequently when he visited the country he avoided as far as possible all contact with the convents and the authority of the monks and sought for information solely among the native population. In this he was assisted by Dr. Eli Smith, a missionary for many years in Syria. In this way he was able to make many additions to the modern science of Biblical Identification, as well as correct false identi-



fications. The lecturer gives considerable attention to the controversy inaugurated by Robinson because of his heterodoxy and sceptical attitude to the so-called Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

The remaining lectures, *Renan and His Contemporaries*, *The Palestine Exploration Fund*, and *The Exploration of the Future*, trace out more fully the evolution of the credulous pilgrim into the man of science. The lecturer reviews the works of the specialists characteristic of this period,—specialists in the departments of archæology, architecture, and the natural sciences. As the subject of his lecture indicates he gives especial prominence to Renan, the first Syrian excavator on a large scale. The work of the Palestine Exploration Fund is reviewed, a work in which the lecturer himself took an active part on the field. The survey is characterized as the monumental work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and the lecturer is inclined to believe that with Sir Walter Besant it is perhaps not too much to say, "that nothing have ever been done for the illustration and right understanding of the historical portion of the Old and New Testaments, since the translation into the Vulgar tongue, which may be compared with this great work." The concluding lecture contains some practical hints to the explorer of the future.

Dr. Bliss, himself in no small way connected with the modern scientific exploration of the country, does not, as is apparent from the above, present in these lectures a compendium of the results of Palestine Exploration, nor a detailed description of monuments, but he does present a critically sifted bibliography, and in this way traces in a broad way the development of the exploration of the country from the earliest times to the present, noting the progress made in the art of identifying Biblical sites, and the appearance and development of a larger and wider interest in the country,—archæological, architectural, geological, botanical, and the interest of the folk-lorist. The lectures supplement very nicely Lic. Dr. J. Benzinger's sketch of "Researches in Palestine" in "Explorations in Bible Lands during the Nineteenth Century" published under the editorship of H. V. Hilprecht.

Note 4, p. 74, is misplaced, it should appear later, p. 85.

IRWIN HOCH DE LONG.

**THE ETERNAL LIFE.** By Hugo Münsterberg. Pages 72. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1905. Price 85 cents.

This little book is written in the form of an argumentative discourse addressed by a man of science to a friend with whom he sits by the open fire apparently in a reminiscent mood, mourning the loss of a third friend buried on the same day. The one so addressed is evidently a believer in the Christian doctrine of

eternal life, while the speaker tries to evolve a doctrine "compatible with the deepest truth of science and the most profound religion." He insists that science is the certainty that nothing can exist outside of the gigantic mechanism of causes and effects moving the stars in the sky as well as the emotions of the mind, but also acknowledges that science is not and should not be an expression of ultimate reality. He declares it to be an indispensable instrument constructed by the human will in the service of human purposes, connecting the things of this chaotic world in an orderly system of causes and effects, and helping to transform the whole world in thought till everything can be understood as a part of such a chain of causes and effects. As the scientist substitutes for the burning wood chemical molecules and for the red light of the fireplace ether waves that are dark, he shows us that so-called scientific realities are only abstractions of the scientist which can never tell us the ultimate meaning of reality, least so of the reality of human personality. The consistent scientist, of course, represents the phenomena of thinking and feeling to take place just as those which cause rain and snow in nature, resulting in the exercise of the human will as the necessary product, but he cannot make us forget that it is our own free will which makes us think of ourselves as mechanisms, that after all in reality we are not objects but subjects which take free attitudes.

While, therefore, personality creates by its attitudes the idea of time as form of its objects it is not itself bound by the prison of time. It is not an object in time but is itself the condition of time. To the scientist the world of objects is a world in time in which constantly new objects follow one another merely to disappear into the irrevocable unreality of the past. If we take ourselves as such causal objects all our past living and striving is likewise completely destroyed and at the moment of death our whole life has become unreal and we naturally look out to see whether time cannot bring us again a piece of reality after death in some form or other.

Would such a life be worth living? Would such a multiplication of phenomena in space and time have any value whatever? On the other hand life perceived as act and not as object, as a system of interrelated will-attitudes is independent of birth and death; it is immortal, it incloses all thinkable time and is eternal, and as such of immeasurable value; it shows us the real meaning of the every-day living. History becomes an endless manifoldness of political, legal, social, and intellectual will demands from the people with whom we come in contact. They challenge consent or dissent, they determine our attitudes in politics, sci-

ence, art and religion, they constitute a mighty system of will-references, a network of will-relations, reaching from the paradise of old to the present. The whole meaning of personal existence thus lies merely in will-relations to be understood and interpreted, but without significance when taken as causes and effects and treated as successive phenomena. The only important relation which a student of Plato bears to the Greek philosopher has nothing to do with the naturalistic fact that biologically two thousand years lie between him and Plato except for purposes of secondary explanations. Thus a thousand years become as one day and one day as a thousand years.

The value, thus, of such a real life is neither in time nor space but in honest action; for whenever we thus act we create values: truth and beauty, morality and culture, religion and philosophy, which demand our submission. But before we aim at these absolute values we must have faith in them, *i. e.*, the purpose of our will must take the character of an absolute value, so that that to which we submit means for us the absolute validity of knowledge, of harmony, beauty, religion, etc. In the temporal, causal world nothing is of real value because everything comes to view as the cause of something else; here is no good and bad, no value and no ideal, but merely a change in complication. But there values have reality because our will assumes attitudes in which ultimate ends are acknowledged and respected, absolute values which make life worth living.

Therefore we do not long for endless duration as our goal, but for more significance and influence and value and satisfaction, giving us complete repose. This aim is of course different for every individual, for every one lives to his own chosen ideals. On the other hand each one is more than an individual. The norms of the good and the true and the beautiful are our will-acts only in so far as we are absolute subjects, in so far as we stand above our will-attitudes as the oversoul, the absolute personality. As such our aim can never find complete satisfaction in any finite experience, this can only be realized in the absolute totality of the world. In the sphere of phenomena such a life has no meaning and value but as an endless personal influence of will, endless in personal relations it is eternal, progressive, ever creating new desires for further achievements in the world at large and exercising an ever richer influence on its friends. This is life eternal.

This is a very refreshing and clever bit of neo-Kantianism with touches of Nietzsche's voluntarism, very lucidly and brilliantly discussed, as we expect it from Professor Münsterberg. But Kant is, after all, more definite and concrete. His ultimate realities

are not merely the vague postulates of the true, the good and the beautiful, his will-attitudes bear definite practical relations to a personal God, to freedom and immortality. His doctrine of the primacy of the will centers, indeed in the firm belief that the highest values are only revealed to man's moral being, to his clear discernment of the "thou shalt" in his heart, but the giver of eternal life is He who speaks the "thou shalt," who is not, we think, merely subjective oversoul. However, in either case the old dualism between knowledge and faith remains, robbing life of its essential unity and with it of its eternal character in the Christian sense; such a doctrine is "not compatible with the most profound religion."

From a metaphysical standpoint Münsterberg's book is very readable and a valuable contribution to the ever-interesting discussion on eternal life.

R. C. SCHIEDT.

**RATIONAL LIVING:** Subtitle, *Some Practical Inferences from Modern Psychology*. By Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin College. Pages 271. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1906. Price \$1.50.

It might seem to be a hasty procedure to attempt to make practical use of results reached in a branch of psychological science which has been carefully studied for so brief a time. The author himself is conscious of the difficulties and expresses his hesitancy in the preface. And yet the mere fact that one so prominent in the world of philosophic thought as President King, has made this attempt, immediately challenges our inquiry into the merits of the work before us, and inclines us to read it with favor.

"Rational Living" is not designed to set forth concrete illustrations of psychological phenomena, but to draw practical suggestions from such illustrations and apply them to human life. This is done in a very readable style which makes the book interesting as well as instructive. The author draws "four great inferences from modern psychology." They are immediately recognized to be justifiable by one who has kept in touch with the modern investigations in this science. They are: (1) The Complexity of Life; The Multiplicity and Intricacy of Relations; (2) The Unity of Man; (3) The Central Importance of Will and Action; (4) The Concreteness of the Real; The Inter-relatedness of all. The book is divided into four parts and developed under the four heads above mentioned.

The author very convincingly sets forth the complexity of our subjective life. He, however, convinces one of life's richness rather than of its confusion. It is necessary to recognize the intricacy of relations in order to properly adjust them and make a simple life out of the complexity. He finds the grounds for

the complex aspect of human nature in the different departments of psychology. It is especially brought to light in the comparative method of psychological study of recent years, as illustrated particularly by Professor William James, of Harvard University. Man needs a "wide range of interests," but his world is no greater than the number of interests he can grasp successfully. His influence, freedom and sanity are measured by the breadth of his interests. All his experiences, however, must be inter-related. There is no separation of sacred and secular. He confronts many paradoxes in the physical, intellectual, and moral life, all of which must be solved in order to save himself from confusion. The simple life is dependent upon the proper solution of the paradoxes; and the proper solution is dependent upon a careful examination and taking into account of all the common activities of daily life.

In discussing "The Unity of Man," the author shows the interdependence of mind and body. They are designed by their Creator to be one in their practical operations. They are a unity. Neither can ignore the other in its activity without grievous loss. The body influences the mind, beneficially, through the presence of pure blood and surplus nervous energy. Disease and fatigue are both immediately effective for ill upon the mind. The consequent need of physical training and care is evident. The mind also influences the body in self-control over the bodily cravings. The will plays a fundamental part in securing rest, recreation, in avoiding fatigue and controlling the emotions. In the conclusion of this subject, the author very clearly suggests intellectual and emotional helps and dangers for living. Among the latter are joyful emotions and their benefits; strained and sham emotions and their dangers; moods and their influence on willing, and dangers of passive emotions, thus showing the unity of the functions of mind and body.

"The Central Importance of the Will and Action" in rational living in the judgment of the author is made apparent by the fact that he devotes one whole part of his book to the subject. One striking difference between the older psychology and the newer, is suggested in the assertion of the former that "a man does what he is at the time" and the latter, that "a man is at the time what he does." Action born of the will truly reveals man. "The natural terminus of every experience is action." It is in the nature of our constitution. In mind and body we are organized for action. Action is necessary for the good health of the body and the sanity of the mind and emotions. But in action the will must control. The training of the will thus becomes an enormous problem for rational living. Self-control in

life's activities prevents exhaustion and yields strength in the intellectual, emotional and volitional faculties of the soul as well as the body. It is therefore the greatest help at hand for the realization of character, happiness and influence.

"The last of the four great inferences"—"The Inter-relatedness of All"—is but the outcome of the preceding. The mind and body are by nature adapted to relations. The fundamental intellectual functions, discrimination, assimilation and synthesis are all relating functions. There is an organic whole in all reality. Hegel brought the "analogy of the organism" to its climax in his philosophy. Since his day almost all scientific study is pursued with this analogy in mind. All persons are related to one another. The value of the historical rests on the "absolute worth of the person." "Relatedness and personality are not opposed." Lötze says, "to be is to be in relations." This is found to be characteristic of the person because the human body with limbs, hearing, sight and voice is made for personal association. Infants witness to this, in that they notice persons before things. The moral history of the race in its friendships and hospitality reveals it. The necessity of respect and consideration for others are thus evinced. The sacredness of the person is established. In social relations we discover uplifting power in the person. We reach the very important conviction that the completion of character is dependent upon fellowship relations. The brotherhood of man thus becomes a reality in idea as well as in experience.

This brief review of the book may serve to convey some idea of its worth. It is very evident that the works of such men as James, Royce, Sully, Starbuck, and others of the immediate past have made this work of Dr. King possible. Its practical benefits to the reader are numerous. It presents two striking suggestions for the ideal life: (1) It convinces one that the deepest needs of the human soul and body conform to the demands of the Christian religion. They are best satisfied by Christian living. Christ understood human nature perfectly. Nothing in the realm of thought so leads us to this faith as the testimony of human nature itself. Dr. King sets forth this testimony admirably. (2) The book also teaches one how to study and to know himself better. It shows the solution of the complexity of life. It clarifies the relation of mind and body. It suggests the normal exercise of the functions of both as necessary for rational living.

The book should find a hearty welcome by ministers of the gospel and all educators, for its helpfulness in studying human needs. It ought to be read also by laymen, and particularly by physicians. It sets one thinking about things which have been too much overlooked in our struggle upwards.

W. STUART CRAMER.



**THE MAKING OF A TEACHER.** By Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Pedagogy in the University of Pennsylvania. 12mo, pages 351, Philadelphia, The Sunday-school Times Company, 1905.

Moral and religious education is attracting not a little attention these times. Only a few days ago, at a great gathering of the secular schoolmen of our country, the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association, held in Louisville, Ky., one of the themes most enthusiastically and thoughtfully discussed was that of "Moral and Religious Instruction in the Schools." The schools referred to were, of course, the public day schools. In that discussion prominent educators voiced the opinion that "we must get back to religious teaching in the schools," that "it was a staggering blow to our school system when it was decided that religious teaching was sectarian. The state superintendent of South Dakota said that their state association had appointed a committee of fifteen, representing as many denominations, to propose some form of religious teaching acceptable to all. However the secular schoolmen may settle the question, the fact remains that, for the present, largely because the secular school has declined to give religious instruction, that part of the adjustment of the American child to the "spiritual possessions of the race" is left almost wholly in the hands of the Sunday-school teacher.

In the Sunday-school, however, conditions are far from satisfactory. Complaints as to the quality of the work done by the Sunday-school teacher are heard on every hand. Possibly much of this complaint is due to a livelier conception of duty and privilege, occasioned by a "divine discontent" with present attainments, even though these be superior to those of the not remote past. Nevertheless, there is much ground for dissatisfaction with the work done in the distinctively religious school. Authorities on pedagogy gravely assure us that the average teaching in the Sunday-schools is considerably below that of the public day school.

How may conditions be improved? Criticism, especially, unless accompanied with intelligent advice, will accomplish little. Most Sunday-school teachers are devoted to their work, but, likewise, most Sunday-school teachers are not sufficiently informed either as to matter or method to be the artists in developing souls that it is desirable they should be.

Here is a book, by a veteran teacher, a student of pedagogy and a lecturer on education, which makes the attempt to give the assistance necessary to make the poor teacher a good teacher, to develop the good teacher into the artist-teacher.

The author rejects the theory that the good teacher is necessarily a born teacher. "Most teachers," he says, "are made—



not born—hence the necessity for training.” In Sunday-school work we must recognize the truth acted upon by the state in training teachers, through normal schools, for the work of the elementary schools, and by the church in disciplining, through colleges and theological seminaries, the young men chosen to instruct the laity.

The teacher, to be a workman approved in word and deed, must know the mind to be educated, to be adjusted to its divine environment. That the novice may gain this knowledge our author attempts, very successfully, we think, and with the minimum of technical phraseology, to give a clear understanding of the principles and laws of mental activity which are essential to successful work with children. The language of the book is, in most places, so clear and non-technical that any earnest teacher, however unlearned in philosophical studies, may clearly apprehend the meaning. In a few places there might be improvement. The chapter on feeling strikes the reviewer as being somewhat vague and not satisfying; yet even here we find most excellent observations on the nature and training of conscience, which Dr. Brumbaugh, very properly, regards as the measure of the difference between our ideal life in thought and our real life in action. His suggestions as to how we may bring about improvement in conscience, how this difference may be made less and less are admirable. The relation between doubt and belief (p. 150) is not very clearly set forth, while on page 219, a phrase “life-lines” is used strangely. Are these words used in the sense employed in palmistry, for prophetic creases in the palms of the hands, or is the author speaking figuratively in nautical terminology? The absence of an index is to be regretted.

There are many most excellent things in the book which were noted down for comment as the volume was read. But for discussion of these space is not available. One thing especially attracted attention: the emphasis laid on the teaching of the Master Christ as the norm or pattern of our teaching. The paragraphs treating on this and on the value of the Bible as an authority on pedagogy are worthy the careful reading and earnest study of every preacher. Improvement in preaching in many pulpits would necessarily follow.

The book is to be commended to all—parents, Sunday-school teachers, pastors—who are concerned with the religious education of the young for, as the author well says, on page 158, “the problem is to comprehend the general principles of the process, common to all good teaching, and then to turn all this broad training to use in the domain of religious training.”

W. W. DEATRICK.

THE GIST OF THE SERMON: An Old Message for Young Men, On the Ground Plan of Cox's Exposition. By Herbert C. Alleman. Philadelphia, Pa., Lutheran Publication Society. Price 75 cents.

This is a book of 230 pages divided into twelve chapters, which "grew out of a series of sermons by the author, in the course of his regular pulpit ministrations when pastor of the College Church, Gettysburg, Pa." The sermons were an exposition and practical application of the Teaching of the Book of Ecclesiastes. We have a constitutional aversion to published sermons and are not much inclined to read books of sermons. Consequently it was with some reluctance that we opened this book for the purpose of reading it; though its chapters are not exactly in the form of sermons. But we had not perused many pages until our attention became rivetted and we read the book to the end with great eagerness. The style of the author is good and his thoughts are fresh. He is a comparatively young man, has read widely, is possessed of a good memory, a vivid and sane imagination, and strong reasoning powers. We find nothing to criticize in this book and much to commend. The author is a Lutheran minister, but there is no specific Lutheranism in these chapters. He deals exclusively with the Christian life and Christian ethics. His aim is to discover the "chief good" which everyone ought to seek and win. It is not to be found in wisdom, or wealth or pleasure, but in obedience to the injunction with which the preacher ends his meditations, namely, to "fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." This book is full of wholesome truth and can be read with pleasure and profit by men and women of every denomination and no denomination. We commend it most heartily to the religious public in general and trust that it may have a wide circulation.

We wish to make two observations. There are some ministers who use the Old and New Testament Scriptures for homiletical purposes as though there were no difference between them. They find as much gospel in the one as in the other. There are others again who discard the Old Testament almost entirely in the thought that it has been superseded by the New. Both classes are one-sided in their practices. The Rev. Mr. Alleman gives us an example of the proper mode to be pursued by these sermons on Ecclesiastes. In order to appreciate the truth of any book of the Bible at its correct value it is necessary to hold in mind the circumstances under which and the purpose for which it was written and the stage of the development of God's Kingdom on earth at the time. Mr. Alleman does this. In the second place we wish to express our pleasure and joy in the fact that this young pastor reads and studies. The contents of this book clearly

show that he devotes some time to investigation and reflection. We are fully persuaded that too many of the young ministers of the Gospel, and perhaps of the older ones also, of all denominations spend all their time and efforts in pastoral work and sermonizing, neglecting general reading and study. This is a mistake. In our opinion just herein is found the cause for the low estimate that is laid on ministers of the Gospel in the present day. They do not study theology or philosophy or science or literature and as a consequence are not learned as they ought to be and do not acquire the mental and moral force which they ought to possess in order to fulfil their calling efficiently. Nothing will be so beneficial to the young minister as the adoption of courses of study from year to year and the diligent pursuit of them. We commend this young minister upon the fact that he has been studying and we commend his book as an excellent one for ministers and laymen to read. His first publication gives promise that he will in the future do still greater and better work for the Lord and His Kingdom.

A. E. TRUXALL